

RELIGION IN LIFE

A CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY

Vol. VIII

Summer Number, 1939

No. 3

EDITORIAL BOARD

JOHN BAILLIE	SAMUEL MCCREA CAVERT	JAMES R. JOY
WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN	CHARLES K. GILBERT	JOHN W. LANGDALE
LUCIUS H. BUGBEE	LYNN HAROLD HOUGH	HOWARD C. ROBBINS
FREDERICK K. STAMM	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN	

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Harvie Branscomb	Carl Sumner Knopf	Halford E. Luccock
Edgar Sheffield Brightman	Edward H. Kraus	Harris Franklin Rall
Clarence Tucker Craig	Umphrey Lee	Richard Roberts
Albert Edward Day	Edwin Lewis	Wilbour E. Saunders
Wilbert F. Howard	McIllyar H. Lichliter	Luther A. Weigle

CONTENTS

	PAGE
After Prohibition and Repeal, What?.....	Douglas Clyde Macintosh 323
The Church's Present Task.....	Frederick C. Grant 339
The Church and the Worshipping Man.....	James H. Straughn 350
The New Testament Conception of the Church.....	Abdel Ross Wentz 360
"Spelling God with the Wrong Blocks".....	George Clark Vincent 368
Psychotherapy and Christianity.....	Rollo R. May 376
What Is the Gospel?.....	Charles E. Schofield 388
The Complete Faith.....	Harry M. Taylor 399
The Unnoticed Irony of Christ.....	Allan A. Hunter 411
The American Community and the Protestant Church.....	R. W. Frank 418
Faith and the Making of New Worlds.....	Samuel H. Miller 427
History and the Social Gospel.....	Nels F. S. Ferré 434
The Meaning of Mysticism for Christianity Today.....	Patricia Grady Hammons 439
The Bible's Revolutionary Relevance.....	Basil Mathews 445
Lyman Abbott.....	Edward Smith Parsons 449
Saint Augustine as a Mystic.....	F. J. Foakes Jackson 456
Suggested by reading <i>Amor Dei</i> .	
Religion for the "Plain" Man.....	R. Birch Hoyle 461
Book Reviews.....	465
Bookish Brevities.....	478

Editorial correspondence should be addressed to John W. Langdale, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Business communications regarding subscriptions, etc., should be addressed to The Abingdon Press, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Entered as second-class matter January 16, 1932, at the post-office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. This number is the July, 1939, issue.

Subscription price, \$2.00 per year; postage free U. S. Possessions and Mexico; to Canada, 18 cents additional; other foreign postage, 30 cents; single copies, 75 cents.

For the convenience of readers in Great Britain, subscriptions will be received by The Epworth Press, 25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1, at the rate of nine shillings and sixpence per year.

Published by

THE ABINGDON PRESS
NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
LIBRARY

Who's Who?

NELS F. S. FERRÉ, Ph.D. Assistant Professor of Theology and of the Philosophy of Religion, Andover Newton Theological School, Newton Centre, Mass.

R. W. FRANK, D.D., Ph.D. Department of Philosophy of Religion and Ethics, Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.

FREDERICK C. GRANT, D.D., S.T.D. Edward Robinson Professor of Biblical Theology at Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

PATRICIA GRADY HAMMONS, B.D. (Union Theological Seminary). Residence: Foreman, Ark.

R. BIRCH HOYLE, A.T.S. Theological Reviewer for the *British Weekly*, Free Church Chaplain for the Borough of Lambeth, London.

ALLAN A. HUNTER, D.D. Minister of the Mount Hollywood Congregational Church, Los Angeles, Cal.

F. J. FOAKES JACKSON, D.D., Litt.D., D.Theol. (Strasbourg). Briggs Graduate Professor of Christian Institutions, Union Theological Seminary, New York, 1916-1934. Residence: Englewood, N. J.

DOUGLAS CLYDE MACINTOSH, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D. Dwight Professor of Theology and Philosophy of Religion, Divinity School, Yale University.

BASIL MATHEWS, M.A. (Oxon.). Professor of Christian World Relations at Boston University and Andover Newton Theological School, Newton Centre, Mass.

ROLLO R. MAY, D.D. Minister of First Congregational Church, Verona, N. J.

SAMUEL H. MILLER, D.D. Minister of the Old Cambridge Baptist Church, Cambridge, Mass.

EDWARD SMITH PARSONS, L.H.D., LL.D. President Emeritus of Marietta College, Marietta, Ohio. Residence: Lane's End, Jaffrey, N. H.

CHARLES E. SCHOFIELD, S.T.B., D.D. President of The Iliff School of Theology, Denver, Colo.

JAMES H. STRAUGHN, D.D. Bishop of The Methodist Church. Residence: Baltimore, Md.

HARRY M. TAYLOR, Ph.D. Assistant Professor of Systematic Theology, Drew University, Madison, N. J.

GEORGE CLARK VINCENT, D.D. Minister of Union Congregational Church, Upper Montclair, N. J.

ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, Ph.D. Professor of Church History, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.

Copyright, 1939, by The Abingdon Press, Inc. All rights reserved—no part of this magazine may be produced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher, except by a reviewer who wishes to quote brief passages in connection with a review written for inclusion in magazine or newspaper.

Printed in the United States of America

After Prohibition and Repeal, What?

DOUGLAS CLYDE MACINTOSH

A FEW years ago, prohibition was almost constantly in the front-page headlines of the daily press. A little later the same thing could be said of the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment and the benefits which were to be expected therefrom. Now we rarely read anything reminiscent of this former very heated controversy. A newspaper-reading recluse might almost gain the impression that the underlying problem had at length been happily solved.

We all know, however, that this is far from being the truth. The "noble experiment" of prohibition, not too nobly conducted either by our law-enforcing agencies or by the general public and the public press, disappointed the hopes of those who had hailed the ratification of the Eighteenth Amendment as the last victorious battle of a long war. And now the perhaps less noble experiment of repeal, also widely promised beforehand as the solution of the problem, has proved to be even more disappointing.

In spite then of the prevalent and easily understood distaste for any further consideration of so seemingly insoluble a problem, may it not be our duty once again to face the question as to what can be done to mitigate the evils notoriously associated with the use of alcoholic liquors? What I propose to do here is briefly to review the history of prohibition and repeal and to present some reflections on the present situation, with a view to suggesting renewed discussion of this vital but perplexing problem.

I

The enactment of prohibitory legislation, contrary to a very general impression, was no sudden new idea, no mere expression of war hysteria. The Continental Congress of 1777 recommended it to the several states. From 1851 to 1855 thirteen of the thirty-one states of the Union at that time adopted it, and in the latter year Abraham Lincoln, who was not only a total abstainer but a prohibitionist, drafted a prohibition bill for the State of Illinois.¹

¹ E. L. Douglass, *Prohibition and Common Sense*, 1931, pp. 10, 15.

In his famous Washington's Birthday address, Lincoln said:

"Whether or not the world would be vastly benefited by a total and final banishment from it of all intoxicating drinks seems to me not an open question. Three-fourths of mankind confess the affirmation with their lips, and I believe all the rest acknowledge it in their hearts!"

The Prohibition Party, organized in 1869, has always been very ineffectual because it adopted and clung to the very unstrategic policy of bringing out third-party candidates, instead of working for a fair representation of the antialcohol sentiment of the country in one or both of the major political parties. This wiser policy was adopted by the Anti-Saloon League, organized in 1893, and from that date it became steadily more evident that national prohibition would be realized.

Before the beginning of the World War the liquor trade could see that prohibition was not far away. The joint resolution which proposed the Eighteenth Amendment was introduced in the House of Representatives on December 4, 1911, and was reintroduced on August 5, 1913. On September 10, 1913, in the *National Liquor Dealers' Journal*, there was an editorial entitled "The Handwriting on the Wall!" containing such sentences as these:

"We are not discussing the benefit or justice of prohibition; but its possibility and its probability in present circumstances. To us there is 'the handwriting on the wall' and its interpretation spells doom. For this the liquor business is to blame; it seems incapable of learning any lesson of advancement, or any motive but profit. To perpetuate itself it has formed alliances with the slums that repel all conscientious and patriotic citizens. It deliberately aids the most corrupt political powers and backs with all its resources the most unworthy men, the most corrupt and recreant officials. It does not aid the purification of municipal, state or national administration. Why? Because it has to ask immunity for its own lawlessness."

Even as early as 1907 the *Wine and Spirit Circular* had contained a similar statement:

"If there is one thing that seems settled beyond question it is that the retail liquor trade of this country must either mend its ways materially or be prohibited in all places save the business or tenderloin precincts of our larger cities."

And on May 6, 1914, the President and the Secretary of the National Wholesale Liquor Dealers Association sent out a circular letter to the Retail Liquor Dealers of the United States urging that "quick action" was "necessary" to prevent "total prohibition of the manufacture and sale of all intoxicating liquors in every state in the United States."²

² "Was Prohibition Slipped Over?" W. H. Burgwin, *The Christian Century*, June 17, 1931.

As a matter of fact, thirty-three of the forty-eight states of the Union were already "dry" before the federal prohibition amendment went into effect.

The Anti-Saloon League, organized in 1893, worked until 1906 for local prohibition of the liquor traffic. From 1906 until 1913 it was dominated by the ideal of securing state-wide prohibition in as many of the states as possible. But in 1913 there was set up the objective of national prohibition of the traffic by amendment to the Federal Constitution. As a result of the co-operation of many public-spirited citizens working in the practical ways outlined by the Anti-Saloon League, in December, 1917, the motion to submit the Eighteenth Amendment to the states passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 282 to 128, and the Senate by a vote of 47 to 8. In less than fourteen months the required number of states had ratified the amendment, and in the end all but two of the other states followed suit.

It may be admitted at once that the resolution of the country through its elected representatives to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquor except under very severe restrictions, made possible the additional crime of violating that law. But that does not necessarily mean that the law was not a good law. To suppose that it did would logically mean an endorsement of anarchy, since every new law makes possible a new form of lawbreaking.

As a matter of fact the prohibition of the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor, except under such safeguards as will amply provide for social welfare, would seem according to common sense to have the same kind of justification as is universally conceded to attach to legislation against the unrestricted freedom of trade in dangerous narcotic drugs. Prohibition is according to common sense, as writers have pointed out, for the following reasons: (1) The desire for alcohol is an acquired, not a natural appetite, and judged in the light of the general individual and social consequences of indulging it, it has no right to exist. (2) The way to control anything is to control its source. (3) You cannot trust people who make a business of pandering to human weakness, and so the only way to deal with so antisocial and criminally-minded a trade as the liquor trade has shown itself to be is to abolish it.³

In a democratic country it would seem that as soon as a majority of the electors favor such prohibition it ought to be enacted, and the police should

³ *Prohibition and Common Sense*, by Earl L. Douglass, The Alcohol Information Committee, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, 1931, pp. 1, 4, 5, 27. Cf. G. E. G. Catlin, in *Liquor Control*, *Home University Library of Modern Knowledge*, Holt, 1931, p. 150.

be held responsible for the enforcement of the law. If the police prove to be corrupted by those interested in a clandestine liquor traffic, the police system should be overhauled and cleansed from top to bottom. If state militia may be called out, during labor troubles, to maintain law and order, it does not seem out of the question to employ units of the army and navy, if necessary in an extreme emergency, to cope with a criminally inclined minority bent upon defying a law the enforcement of which would admittedly make for social welfare. Let no one be so pusillanimous or pessimistic about a democratic system of government as to think that a law approved by the consciences of a majority of the electorate cannot be enforced with a reasonable measure of effectiveness. It is entirely proper and under certain circumstances becomes the duty of citizens to co-operate with government for the enforcement of law by reporting cases of flagrant and persistent violation of laws well designed to secure the public good. The Supreme Court of the United States has given forth the statement:

"It is the duty and the right not only of every peace officer of the United States, but of every citizen, to assist in prosecuting and in securing the punishment of any breach of peace of the United States. It is . . . his right and duty to communicate to the executive officers any information which he has of the commission of any offense against those laws; and such information given by a private citizen is a privileged and confidential communication, for which no action of libel or slander will lie and the disclosure of which cannot be compelled, without the assent of the government."⁴

The prohibition law was a good law and it did not come too soon, we would claim, if only those who originally believed in it had remained faithful and had insisted upon scientific ways and means of securing its enforcement. Those engaged in the liquor traffic expected the law to be enforced, as those who witnessed, as I did, the wholesale giving away of bottled liquor in downtown saloons on the eve of prohibition, can testify. And for the first year or two enforcement, while far from perfect, was reasonably good. After prohibition had been in force for some time Miss Jane Addams, of Chicago, wrote:

"Here around Hull House we used to watch whiskey and beer being left at the saloons by the drayload. The poverty and suffering from drink were appalling. There is such a difference now that it seems like another world. Our poor are moving away into better places. The whole standard of life is rising for them. Drinking has decreased, and so has our work of rehabilitating families wrecked through intemperance. We have hardly any squalid homes or neglected families to deal with. I would not see the old system again for anything."

⁴ Quoted by Wayne B. Wheeler, in *Law Enforcement*, p. 252.

Commander Evangeline Booth stated, in testimony given as late as 1931, that whereas prior to prohibition the Salvation Army in New York City would often pick up between 1,200 and 1,300 drunkards in a single night, this number dropped to 400 after the dry act went into effect. Drunkenness had dropped 60 per cent along the Bowery, 70 per cent in Boston, 75 per cent in Louisville, Kentucky, and in similar proportions in other cities where the Salvation Army kept records.⁵

It was not only in the slums that great improvement was evident. The same thing was true of colleges. From Yale in the East to Stanford in the West came united testimony to that effect. Professor Charles C. Clark of Yale University, not himself a prohibitionist, testified:

"I will admit to you that the effect of prohibition at Yale University has been good. I know whereof I speak, for I have been a member of the Committee on Discipline from a time dating back many years before prohibition. I know conditions intimately. I do not pretend that the students are prohibitionists or are not drinking, but the change has been simply revolutionary. In the old days our Committee was constantly busy with cases involving intoxication and the disorders arising from it. Now we have practically no business of the kind to transact."⁶

Prohibition, even though poorly enforced in the later years, paid in dollars and cents. Bank and post-office savings accounts increased greatly in number under prohibition; industrial insurance doubled in a few years;⁷ vast sums were spent by workers for automobiles, radios, and the like; and yet there was so much money in the hands of the people generally for speculative purposes that some economists place a considerable part of the blame for the market crash of 1929 upon prohibition. Not all of the prosperity of the years 1920 to 1929 was due to prohibition, but it is significant that not one economist could be found to defend the antiprohibition cause on economic grounds at the 1926 meeting of the American Economic Association.⁸ Estimates as to the economic gains through increase in the productivity of labor as conditioned by prohibition vary. According to Professor Irving Fisher it was three billion dollars a year; according to Paul Nystrom, Professor of Marketing in the School of Business of Columbia University, it was five billion; President Hoover's estimate of ten per cent would make it over six billion.⁹

⁵ Article by R. L. Duffus, *New York Times*, March 1, 1931.

⁶ Quoted by H. E. Fosdick, Sermon, *The Prohibition Question*, October 14, 1928. This statement was fairly typical.

⁷ Earl L. Douglass, *Prohibition and Common Sense*, Ch. IX.

⁸ Fisher and Brougham, *The "Noble Experiment,"* pp. 147-8; E. L. Douglass, *op. cit.*, pp. 172f., 189.

⁹ I. Fisher, "Prohibition in Dollars and Cents," *The Christian Century*, October 22, 1930.

A few years after national prohibition had been enacted the underground campaign of the liquor traffic had gotten well under way. There were two main objectives; first, to sell as much liquor as possible illegally; and second, to get pretended friends, and, as soon as possible, real friends of temperance to make the increasing illegal sale of liquor an excuse or reason for demanding the repeal of prohibition. Genuine friends of temperance should have had discernment enough to see that the liquor trade would not have continued to favor a return to the licensing system if they had thought it was going to mean a decrease in the use of intoxicating liquor.¹⁰ But the entire secular press and indeed practically all but the Protestant religious press was sold out—at least figuratively and no doubt in many instances, literally—to the forces working for the return of the legalized liquor trade.

Gradually the illicit liquor trade became organized, and naturally it fell into the hands of the criminal or near-criminal class. Rumrunning, hijacking, bootlegging and the speakeasy figured prominently in newspapers and conversation. Profits which formerly went to legal importers, manufacturers, and distributors of liquors now went to leaders of criminal gangs. This put great power into the hands of criminal masterminds.¹¹ But if anything like the energy which has characterized J. Edgar Hoover and his aides in tracking down gangsters and kidnapers in the last few years had been shown by law enforcement agents under prohibition, there would have been a very different story to tell. On this point the report of Mr. A. E. Sawyer to the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement (Wickersham Commission) is very explicit:

"Any survey of the history of the budget for prohibition indicates the lack of drive with which Washington has faced this problem of enforcement. When Congress showed a willingness to add five times the amount necessary to make the work really effective, the Bureau gave the excuse that the courts were crowded with prohibition cases, and that a larger staff of enforcement officers merely would mean increased difficulty and delay in prosecution.

"It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that some of the greatest handicaps in the administration of the prohibition laws have been political in character. These handicaps have resulted from the attempt to steer a middle course and avoid offense to important political groups having affiliation with large commercial interests."¹²

¹⁰ Cf. *Prohibition at Its Worst*, Irving Fisher, 1926; *Prohibition Still at Its Worst*, by I. Fisher and H. B. Brougham, 1928; *The "Noble Experiment,"* by the same authors, 1930. The Alcohol Information Committee.

¹¹ But this is simply the new form which the activities of the criminally-minded liquor traffic took under the special conditions imposed by prohibition. As Harry Emerson Fosdick has said, "The liquor trade in the United States always has been lawless. . . . It always has conspired against any government that licensed it or any laws that were supposed to control it" (Sermon on the Prohibition Question, October 14, 1928).

¹² *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, September, 1932, pp. 16, 17.

In the Wickersham Report itself the inadequate observance and enforcement of the Volstead Act was attributed in part to the inadequate organization of enforcement, also in large part to lack of co-operation of state governments and of the public at large.¹³

The Supreme Court of the United States did much to encourage the nullification of the National Prohibition Law by its illogical and seemingly pusillanimous decision in the case of the United States *versus* Farrar, and in its evasion of any answer on the crucial question in the case of the United States *versus* Morris. Action, such as it was, on both cases took place on the same day, May 26, 1930. In the Farrar case a purchaser of bootleg liquor had been prosecuted by the government for his part in the illegal transaction. The Justices of the Supreme Court were faced with a dilemma:

"It was felt that should the Supreme Court hold the purchase of liquor itself an offense prohibited by the national Prohibition Act, then great numbers of otherwise law-abiding citizens might suddenly find themselves in the class of criminals. . . . On the other hand, should the Supreme Court hold that the purchase of liquor was not an offense, then the anomalous situation would arise, where of two parties to the same transaction, one is guilty and the other is innocent."¹⁴

Although it has been from time immemorial a scarcely questioned principle that the participant in an illegal transaction is *particeps criminis*, the honorable judges of the Supreme Court shrank from following either legal precedent or logic, and chose to declare the purchaser not a guilty participant in the violation of a law which it would have been greatly to the true interest of the people to have observed, and all because to have ruled otherwise would have been to recognize so many as guilty.

II

In the Wickersham Report, signed by ten of the eleven commissioners (although in one instance it must have been with mental reservations), along with the expression of opposition to repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment and even to the legalizing of the manufacture and sale of light wines and beer, there are recommendations against either the return of the legalized saloon or the adoption of any system according to which the government itself would be required to go into the liquor business.¹⁵

¹³ *New York Times*, January 21, 1931.

¹⁴ G. and C. A. Hankin, *Progress of the Law in the United States Supreme Court, 1929-30*, Legal Research Service, Washington, D. C., 1930, p. 344.

¹⁵ For the full report of the Commission see the *New York Times*, January 21, 1931.

In the 1932 Presidential nomination convention the Democrats declared unequivocally for repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment, and recommended the enactment of measures to promote temperance, prevent the return of the saloon and bring the liquor traffic into the open. The Democrats were elected, and on February 16 and 20, 1933, the Senate and the House of the last Lame Duck Congress passed a resolution proposing a twenty-first amendment to the Constitution, for the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment. By December 5, 1933, ratification by three-fourths of the states having taken place, the Eighteenth Amendment was declared by President Roosevelt to have been repealed. To this announcement the President saw fit to append certain remarks which read ironically enough after but five years of experience of the "benefits" of repeal:

"I ask especially that no state shall by law or otherwise authorize the return of the saloon either in its old form or in some modern guise. . . . We must remove forever from our midst the menace of the bootlegger and such others as would profit at the expense of good government, morals and social integrity. The objective we seek through a national policy is the education of every citizen toward a greater temperance throughout the nation."

But in the words of Senator Capper, "We may repeal Prohibition, but we cannot repeal the Liquor Problem."¹⁶ Nearly five months after repeal, in a Washington dispatch to the *New York Times* dated April 28, 1934, Joseph H. Choate, Jr., Director of the Federal Alcohol Control Administration, wrote:

"As concerns liquor, the United States is living in a fool's paradise. We know that . . . the bootleg trade is still with us, but we refuse to see its size or to recognize what it has done to us. . . . We now have facts from which the reasonable inference is . . . that bootleg production continues on so huge a scale as to constrain us to the conclusion that our people must be consuming greater quantities of spirits than they did in preprohibition days, and that, while the legal industry has, and is using to its utmost extent, capacity enough to supply the preprohibition demand, the illegal industry has, and is using a greater capacity, the product of which the public is presumably buying and consuming."

At the end of the first year of legalized liquor the government's revenue fell \$150,000,000 short of expectations, the deficiency being accounted for mainly by the persistence of bootlegging despite all efforts to wipe it out.¹⁷ On a page of the *New York Times* for December 2, 1934, under the heading, "Year

¹⁶ Quoted by J. D. Rockefeller, Jr., in *Toward Liquor Control* by R. B. Fosdick and A. L. Scott, Harpers, 1933, Foreword p. vii.

¹⁷ *New York Times*, December 1, 1934.

of Repeal Finds Bootlegging Unchecked, Saloon Back, Revenues Low," there are summary reports of the year's results from various parts of the country. Here are some statements from the New York report:

"The wets said that arrests for drunkenness would fall off after repeal. On the basis of New York City's one-year experience, they were wrong. . . . In the first ten months of 1933, . . . total arrests involving drunkenness were 5,357. . . . The statistics show an alarming increase in the accidents caused by drinking drivers. . . . Repeal has brought back the saloon under new names. . . . Repeal has diverted \$2,000,000,000 from legitimate business into the pockets of the liquor interests. Consumption of milk has decreased so alarmingly that the dairy industry has been threatened and the legislature appropriated \$500,000 for a milk publicity campaign. At the same time the wholesale liquor dealers appropriated \$16,000,000 to advertise alcoholic liquor to increase its consumption."¹⁸

The situation has become still more serious in the last two or three years. That liquor production has been rising is indicated by the fact that 258,956,886 gallons were registered with the United States Treasury's alcohol unit in the year ending June 30, 1937, as compared with 253,867,925 in the preceding twelve months, and 169,126,472 gallons in 1935. The imports of distilled liquors in 1937 were about 33 per cent greater than in 1936, and the wine imports over 50 per cent greater. The total amount of taxable liquor released for consumption in the fiscal year 1936 was 33.5 per cent over that for 1935. The nation's liquor bill for 1937 was said to be over \$3,750,000,000, and may be estimated to have reached by now a total, since repeal, of some sixteen billions—enough to have built well over three million five-thousand-dollar homes.

Meanwhile bootlegging has continued to flourish. In 1936 there was published an authoritative study of the problems presented by the return of the legalized liquor traffic.¹⁹ In a chapter entitled "Law Enforcement" we read:

"The most discouraging thing about governmental regulation of the liquor traffic since repeal is that the governments have succeeded in regulating only a portion of it. . . . The bootlegger continues to plague every unit of law enforcement and to share in every phase of the commerce in liquor. . . . When one road is closed to him he takes another."²⁰

¹⁸ See *America's New Saloon Tavern*, By E. L. Eaton, Published by Prohibition vs. Repeal Literature, Washington, D. C., 1934.

¹⁹ *After Repeal: A Study of Liquor Control Administration*, by L. V. Harrison and E. Laine, with foreword by Luther Gulick, Harpers, 1936.

²⁰ *Op. cit.*, pp. 201, 202, 209; cf. pp. 210, 211, 212.

Essentially the same situation still exists. In New York City some time ago fifty-four men were indicted as members of a liquor ring said to have sold 1,000,000 gallons of whiskey in the city annually and to have defrauded the government of \$1,800,000 in taxes in three years.²¹

According to the crime reports of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, "the ratio per 100,000 of the population charged with the offense of intoxication was 102.6 per cent more in 1936 than in 1932; 65.4 per cent more than in 1933; 13.2 per cent more than in 1934, and 4.4 per cent more than in 1935." According to the annual reports of the Attorney General of the United States, in 1927, under prohibition, 26.1 per cent of all commitments to federal penal institutions were for violation of the liquor laws, whereas under repeal the percentage rose to 39.3 in 1934, 51 per cent in 1935, and 52 per cent in 1936. Drinking among women has materially increased since the repeal of prohibition. The thirty-seven presidents of women's clubs in New York State who replied to a questionnaire of the State Liquor Authority in 1936 were unanimous in this opinion. Martin Nelson, of Keeley Institute, reports a considerable increase among woman patients who want to take the "Keeley Cure." More than a million girls are said to be employed as barmaids in the United States.

Alcoholism, according to investigators eminent in the medical profession, has now reached the proportions of a "great chronic emergency." It is said to be causing 100,000 deaths annually. As a result of a careful scientific study of 50,000 cases of alcoholism admitted to the Boston City Hospital, conducted under the leadership of Dr. Merrill Moore of that institution and the Medical School of Harvard University, and backed by a WPA grant, it is announced that alcoholism has been rapidly increasing since repeal. The number of deaths from alcoholism at the hospital has doubled since prohibition came to an end in 1933. According to Dr. C. A. Elliott, of the Northwestern University Medical School, while the number of cases of cirrhosis of the liver dropped sharply at the Cook County (Chicago) Hospital under prohibition, since repeal it has gone back to its former level. Such facts throw a strange light upon the remark of the distinguished English writer, Aldous Huxley, when on the occasion of his visit here in 1937 he congratulated us on having gotten rid of "that beastly thing, prohibition." It is difficult to see how

²¹ Cf. also *New York Times*, January 15, March 15, August 2, 1938.

the *New York Times* can bring itself to say, speaking of Repeal, "The results have been beneficial."²²

It is safe to say that under modern conditions alcohol is much more dangerous to the nonuser than any narcotic drug. Among the crimes for which drunkenness is responsible, the manslaughter (or what should in many instances be recognized as criminal manslaughter) caused by drunken driving has received chief attention in recent years. The number of deaths in automobile accidents in the United States in 1933 under nominal prohibition with almost no effort at enforcement was 23,943; in 1934 the number had risen to 35,563, an increase of over 55 per cent in one year—the first full calendar year after the repeal of prohibition. In the same year more than a million were injured in automobile accidents; indeed some estimates are as high as two million. In only three states was there a decrease in such accidents in 1934, and one of these was Kansas, still under state prohibition. During the 1934 Labor Day week end alone, between 250 and 400 were killed and from 10,000 to 12,000 injured in automobile accidents. In 1935 the automobile deaths had risen to 36,400, and by 1936 to 47,828, an increase, for the first three years after repeal, of 108 per cent.²³ In 1937 the deaths in motor-vehicle accidents were still about 40,000, with the estimated number of the injured put at two million. The fact is, the automobile has cost the United States about twice as many lives as all the wars in her history from 1776 to the present.²⁴

For these automobile accidents alcohol is largely responsible. Drunken driving commonly heads the lists in the causes given for revoking drivers' licenses. In the first six months of 1937 the number of motorists who lost their driving licenses in New York State in penalty for driving while intoxicated was nearly double the number for the first six months of 1936. In more than ten per cent of the cases of pedestrian deaths in automobile accidents the pedestrian himself had been drinking. In about 40 per cent of the automobile fatalities in New York City in 1937 the victim was found to have been drinking alcoholic beverages.²⁵ In 21 per cent of the accidents involving intoxicated drivers in New York State in 1937 the driver was exceeding the

²² June 21, 1938.

²³ See *The United States News*, July 19, 1937.

²⁴ In *The United States News*, Washington, for October 14, 1935, the total number of Americans killed in all our wars was given as 244,357, and the number of automobile deaths for fifteen years ending in 1935 as 388,936. For the 18 years ending in 1938, the number may be estimated at 100,000 more. See also "Death Begins at Forty," *Travelers' Life Insurance Company*, Hartford.

²⁵ *New York Times*, July 18, 1938.

speed limit, and in 33 per cent of the cases the drunken driver was on the wrong side of the road. On the basis of scientific studies made in England and America the statement has been given out authoritatively that even small amounts of alcohol affect vision and "lead many persons to make rapid decisions less judiciously than they otherwise would."²⁶

It is a significant fact that during the first two or three years after the repeal of prohibition very little was said in the press of the country about the use of liquor as a menace to public safety. It is here asked whether the millions spent on liquor advertising had any influence upon the strange reticence of the press. But the facts came to be too patent to be much longer generally ignored. Some time ago the Automobile Manufacturers Association decided to concentrate, in its general safety campaign, on the problem of drunken driving. And even the distillers began to deplore the great increase in automobile accidents due to extensive drinking and to support the slogan, "Driving and drinking don't mix."

III

As a result of the failure to give the prohibition law adequate support, with the consequent repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment, the temperance cause in this country has been thrown back to about where it stood more than a hundred years ago. We are faced with the necessity of beginning over again a campaign of temperance education similar to that inaugurated by Lyman Beecher in the second decade of the nineteenth century, and of preparation of public opinion for really effective temperance legislation.

It may be worth while briefly to recall some of the features of that early nineteenth-century temperance movement. In 1811, at a General Association of Congregational Ministers of Connecticut, a committee reported that while intemperance was increasing in an alarming manner, the members of the committee "were obliged to confess that they did not perceive that anything could be done." Lyman Beecher moved that a committee of three be appointed to report ways and means of arresting the tide of intemperance. The committee was appointed, with Beecher himself as chairman. The very next day the committee brought in a report containing many practical recommendations, such as that parents be urged to cease serving ardent spirits on their tables, that church members should cease to regard the serving of alcoholic liquors as essential to hospitality, and that employers should no longer serve

²⁶ It is a well-known fact that in Allied armies during the World War rum was given to the drivers going up to the front, in order that they might "take more risks" to deliver their supplies.

them to their employees. The report was adopted and an honest effort was made to put its recommendations into effect. Some time later Lyman Beecher preached and published six sermons against intemperance, which were widely influential in the growth of the total abstinence movement. This found expression in the organization of temperance societies, the introduction of temperance education in church and public schools, and the beginnings of restrictive legislation for the control and gradual eradication of the legalized traffic in intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes. Once more, after a century and a quarter, we need another Lyman Beecher to inaugurate a new temperance movement such as may eventuate in a similar series of much-needed reforms.

Something can be done from year to year to promote restrictive and other temperance legislation. For example, as I write, Connecticut citizens are being asked to write to members of the Judiciary Committee of the State Legislature, urging the approval of bills limiting the number of package liquor stores to one for every 2,500 inhabitants and the number of places selling by the glass to one place to 1,000 inhabitants; a bill prohibiting minors from being in any room where alcoholic liquor is sold over the bar; a bill to prohibit Sunday sale of alcoholic liquor; a bill providing local option by voting districts instead of by towns; a bill prohibiting billboard advertising of alcoholic liquor; a bill requiring the alcoholic content of liquor to be placed on all containers; a bill providing for a voluntary blood test in the case of an arrest for drinking driving; a bill prohibiting the issuing of permits to noncitizens, and a bill prohibiting the display of alcoholic liquor in drugstores and limiting drugstores to the sale of liquor on prescription only. At the same time citizens are being asked to express themselves in opposition to such bills as the following: a bill to permit minors to handle alcoholic liquor in grocery stores; a bill lengthening the hours of sale; a bill to permit the sale of beer in CCC camps; a bill providing for the classification of hard cider (5 to 10 per cent alcohol) as "soft drink," and a bill providing for the sale of hard liquors in taverns. This last, if passed, would double the number of places selling hard liquor by the drink.

There are other directions in which progress in the promotion of temperance can be or is already being made. Little is being done as yet in comparison with what might be and needs to be done to provide effective temperance education in the public schools; but much has been accomplished already toward extending the areas being brought under local prohibition.

Already, in 1935, prohibition forces, working through local option elections, won an increase of 149 per cent in the number of towns and 94 per cent in the number of counties entering the dry column. This meant 583 counties voting dry in that year. According to W. S. Alexander, Federal Alcohol Administrator, reporting over a year ago, out of 7,000 local option fights waged since the repeal, over 5,000 had resulted in victories for the temperance forces.²⁷

It is not to be wondered at that, as a result of five years of the more than doubtful "benefits of repeal," not only church people but politicians and even officials of the liquor trade are beginning to anticipate the eventual return of prohibition or something like it. It remains to be determined whether future developments in the national area shall be in the direction of a return to prohibitory legislation or toward some form of the Government Dispensary system. Among individual proposals for dealing with the liquor problem in the future, one of the most radical and far-reaching was already announced toward the end of 1933 with the hearty endorsement, interestingly enough, of John D. Rockefeller, Jr., whose conversion to the cause of repeal had been acclaimed throughout the country in the antiprohibition press on the 6th and 7th of June, 1932. At the instance of Mr. Rockefeller, Raymond B. Fosdick and Albert L. Scott undertook an extensive study of experience in liquor control in the United States, Canada and European countries, and embodied their findings and conclusions in a book entitled *Toward Liquor Control*.²⁸ The most striking thing in the book was the studied conclusion that "the elimination of the profit motive, if it could be accomplished, was, for America at least, the most promising road to successful control,"²⁹ together with Mr. Rockefeller's acceptance of the principle "that only as the profit motive is eliminated is there any hope of controlling the liquor traffic in the interest of a decent society."³⁰ What was envisaged by these writers was mainly the elimination of private profit as a stimulus to sales in the retail liquor business; but unless the incentive of private profit were also taken from the manufacturers, no doubt much of the evil of overstimulating sales, through advertising and in other ways, would continue.³¹ Furthermore, even under the system of government sale there might naturally be considerable conflict between

²⁷ *New York Times*, February 22, 1938.

²⁸ Harpers, 1933.

²⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 57; cf. pp. 18, 56-61.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. x.

³¹ Cf. Mrs. J. S. Sheppard, *New York Times*, April 8, 1934.

the humanitarian desire to reduce consumption and the practical business point of view with its interest in providing revenue for government enterprises.³²

Information as to what has been happening under a system of government handling of the traffic in Canada is not altogether reassuring. In that country, after a few years of prohibition (except in Quebec, where there was only partial prohibition) the government took over the liquor traffic. As compared with the record for 1922 under prohibition, the record of 1929 (under government sale) showed, with an increase of population of ten per cent, an increase of 55 per cent in drunkenness, 127 per cent in liquor law violations, 126 per cent in other minor offenses, and 53 per cent in major crimes. In six years there was an increase of 554 per cent in convictions for drunken driving, in three years an increase of 93 per cent in fatal highway accidents, and in four years a 33 per cent increase in industrial accidents. With the easier access to supplies, bootlegging still flourishes. Drinking among women has increased, because of the accessibility of liquor in the home, and because of the seeming respectability of a commodity handled by the Government. Furthermore, the liquor trade is "in politics" more than ever before.³³

It may well be that before the final solution of the liquor problem can be expected we must have a more thoroughgoing elimination of the profit motive than even Mr. Rockefeller and his reporting investigators had in mind. If the deflecting influence of profit motivation could be eliminated entirely, then—and then only, perhaps—would the needlepoint of rational insight be left free to point to the pole of radical abolition of any and every form of commercial exploitation of this unnatural appetite for alcoholic liquors.³⁴ It may be, however, that it will not be until after much educational work has been done that the country will be ready to venture once more to enact a national prohibitory law and to follow it up with the necessary steps for making it an indubitable success. In the meantime, some of the best features of the Swedish system

³² Cf. R. B. Fosdick and A. L. Scott, *op. cit.*, pp. 107ff. On State monopoly systems see Harrison and Laine, *After Repeal*, Chs. V, VI.

³³ Cf. Hearings on the Modification of the Volstead Act, before the Committee on the Ways and Means, House of Representatives, December 7-14, 1932, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1932, p. 397; Clarence True Wilson, "Drinking in Accordance with Law," *Collier's Weekly*, October 4, 1930; G. Gordon, editor *Toronto Globe*, in *Government Control: Ontario's Warning*, quoted by E. L. Douglass, *Prohibition and Common Sense*, p. 270; *ib.*, pp. 146f.; *New York Times*, March 2, 1934. See articles, "Liquor 'Control' in Canada," and "How would Canada's Liquor System Work in the United States?" by Ben H. Spence, *The Christian Century*, January 28, and February 4, 1931. See the same author's *Liquor Control in Canada*, pp. 37 f., et passim.

³⁴ For a statement of objectives in liquor control see "A Message on the Liquor Problem," *Federal Council Bulletin*, January, 1934, and "Ten Questions Left Unsettled by Repeal," by R. L. Duffus, *New York Times*, section 9, December 10, 1933.

might well be adopted in this country. Among such features are "disinterested management through the elimination of profits, and control of the individual by passbook, or license."⁸⁵

There is much to be said for the Swedish system, or something like it, as a temporary halfway measure. But the burden of proof rests on anyone who would propose anything less than total prohibition of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes as an ultimate objective and solution of the drink problem. Because of the hardness of men's hearts it may be necessary to temporize and compromise, but I am optimistic enough to believe that in the end it will not be so—or should I say pessimistic enough to fear that in the end only the most drastic method of dealing with the drink evil will serve to safeguard the race from threatening disaster? But in any case, what is imperatively called for at present is a return to the old ways of temperance education and personal abstinence in a spirit of solicitude lest the exercise of liberty in this matter should become a stumbling block to them that are weak.

⁸⁵ Marquis W. Childs, *Sweden: The Middle Way*, Yale Press, 1936, Chap. VIII, esp. p. 106. In Sweden passbooks are refused not only to chronic alcoholics, habitual drunkards, and criminals, but to unmarried men under twenty-five years of age, and even after that the allowance is low. To guard against the government itself being tempted to encourage the consumption of liquor as a source of revenue, it has been provided that the revenue from liquor may not be used for general budgetary purposes. It is used to support homes for the corrective treatment of alcoholics and habitual drunkards, for compensating the municipalities for the loss of the revenue they would otherwise have derived from licensing the sale of liquor, and for the amortization of the national debt.⁸⁶

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 108, 111.

The Church's Present Task

FREDERICK C. GRANT

THE other day I had lunch with a boyhood friend, whom I had not seen for thirty years. Our ways parted, long ago, and my friend has since become a specialist in social service and psychiatry. We talked of "old times," old friends and acquaintances, and the happy days once shared in a little village that nestles amid the hills of a Western state. Then we talked about our separate paths, since they had diverged, and the various ways we had come these thirty years. Finally my friend said, "I want to ask you a very frank question: How can any intelligent young man go into the ministry today? I've never understood it—nor how any educated man, who knows books and philosophy and science and the modern outlook on things, can devote himself to training men for the ministry. I wish you'd explain."

Now my friend is not representative of social service or psychiatry as a whole, though perhaps of the majority. Many persons in those professions look upon religion as at least the ally of psychiatry, one medium of cure for the ills of certain pathological states, though perhaps not of all; perhaps only in the case of those, specifically, who have had an early religious upbringing, and hence can be resensitized and reawakened. And so I was somewhat surprised: for I happen to know, as we all do, other psychiatrists and social workers who are favorable to the Church and to religion.

But I did not argue that point. Instead, I tried to explain how an intelligent young man—for I know many of them, too—might wish to enter the ministry. The basic motive, I believe, is the one our psychiatrists and social workers approve—and the best of them follow—in their own choice of a career: namely, the motive to help other people, specifically people in trouble. This motive my friend understood and admired. But when I went on to describe the institutional side, the Church and its services and its doctrines, then my friend demurred. All this seemed like so much useless baggage; like taking along the old family sofa and the overstuffed chairs on a holiday motor trip, say, or on a march to the battle front.

It never harms us to be stopped in this fashion and made to give a reason

for "the faith that is in us," and to justify our course in the eyes of courageous, earnest men and women who are devoted to the high aims of human welfare but who think we are wasting our time and diverting our energies through our antiquated methods or our futile conservatism.

The answer I gave my friend is only a partial answer; it could not well be anything more, in a few minutes after luncheon. But I tried to sketch out the main lines of an explanation. A full answer would require a discussion of theology and philosophy. For back of these questions lie still profounder questions and assumptions. What is the criterion of a worth-while life? What are the final standards of human welfare? What is human society headed for? Or has it any intelligent aim? Does God exist, and has He any purpose for the world, or for the lives of individual human beings? What are the factors that eventually determine human destiny? Is it possible for anyone to control and shape—or reshape—his own destiny? Or are we the playthings, not of the gods, but of blind mechanical forces which set the stage and assigned our lines, long ago, so that all we have to do, all we *can* do, is to walk out and recite our few stammering phrases, like animated, speaking puppets, and then vanish? The question comes down, at last, to this: Do you believe, or not, that the greatest factor in any person's life is his response—or his failure to respond—to the will or purpose of the living God? Do you believe, or not, that social advance lies in that direction too; and that nations, classes, groups, communities stand or fall by the same continual judgment?

I do not mean to say that if you believe in God, you will naturally pack up all the baggage heretofore described, and carry the family sofa with you to the front! Much in my friend's criticism was sound. In fact, if we had completely shared the same experience, we too might think of the Church and its methods as antiquated and harmful, or at least as useless and really a burden upon society. What is that experience, and its resulting picture, its composite of impressions? Four churches in a village that could really support only one, or at most two. Competition, rivalry and chronic bitterness between three of the four congregations. The ministers not on speaking terms. Dull, uninspiring sermons on most Sundays—or sermons that said the same thing in slightly different ways fifty Sundays a year. Then special meetings for two weeks in winter, and a perfect orgy of emotional appeal and response. Church schools led and taught by earnest men and women without adequate knowledge, with hours on end devoted to the ark and the flood and

Israel's adventures in the desert and the wicked kings in Jerusalem and Samaria; and not a hint of ethical teaching, or of the real problems that people face today, or of the profound social transformations taking place before our very eyes—even in that lovely valley surrounded by its shelter of hills. A theology that was mainly controversial, anti-this or anti-that, with no grasp upon the great elemental principles of God and His revelation, and the way of life opened up in Christ. Salvation meant a verbal acceptance of the atonement, not a new life in grace. I remember an Easter service I attended there, with a powerful discourse on the evils of alcohol, by an agent of the Anti-Saloon League. I am not trying to caricature the religion of that community, for I love it—both the community and the religion, especially the sturdy, honest, devoted men and women who supported those churches. But it was narrow, and had nothing much to say to a whole generation of youngsters who were learning, at high school and elsewhere, about a larger world outside, and who felt themselves being drawn, strongly and irresistibly, into the powerful currents of this great modern world.

So when my friend, like many another contemporary idealist, refers to the Church as "baggage," what is meant is not the vital heart of religion, or the gospel of Christ, or the central mystery of worship which is the mystical or sacramental union with God, or the ideal of Christian character, or the social passion of the modern church—but something already passing out of existence, and being sloughed off in the forward advance of religion. Only, I fear that some of our friends are not aware of the vital forces which are at work in the modern church, either as freshly created, or as now being revived after some generations of dormancy; instead, they fix their attention upon the village church as remembered from their youth, and they identify religion with that. This procedure is human and understandable enough; but it provides no adequate basis for a judgment upon the present situation and outlook of the Church.

For there are certainly new movements under way—or revivals of old movements—that spring from the unceasing vitality and perennial youth of the Christian faith itself; and our reason for entering the ministry today is directly related to these. We are not laboring to carry up sofas to the battle front; instead, we are stripping for action, "laying aside every weight that hinders," and "the sin that so easily besets us," and preparing to do the work to which the living God Himself has called us in this our own new time.

Of these forces or tendencies within the modern Church, I wish to speak of three:

1. The ecumenical movement—Christian reunion
2. The way of renewal in worship
3. The Christian social hope

I

If ever there was need for a united stand, and for united effort, in the cause of religion, it is now. Divided, we may lose out; united, there is hope of advance. I do not think it necessary to review the reasons for looking upon reunion, not simply as desirable, as economical and efficient and laborsaving, but as indispensable, as the *sine qua non* of success in the Christian campaign. We are all familiar with these reasons—certainly after the series of conferences in which we have shared of late. Younger men are aware, as some of us older ones are not, of the strength of the forces arrayed against us. They have not been brought up to think of the Church as an institution which will survive automatically and inevitably; they see the possibilities of defeat; they take seriously the situation in Russia and Spain and elsewhere, and do not toss aside the problem with a confident assertion, "It can't happen here." It is for this very reason that some of us are expecting great things of them. Christian reunion is not a dream of what may perhaps take place a hundred years from now; that will probably be too late. It must come within ten or fifteen years, if it is to come in time.

The immediate problem is not the *need* for reunion: I think we all agree upon that. The immediate problem is how to go about it, and what to aim at, right away. There are those who plead caution, and say, "Let us do nothing hastily, lest we jeopardize our heritage from the past. And let us not act as if reunion were already effected, and we had nothing more to do short of pooling our communicant lists, exchanging pulpits, and holding reunion services every Sunday." It is no use scoffing at such a protest as if it were inspired by moss-grown conservatism. There is good sense in it. We only deceive ourselves if we pretend that our "unhappy divisions" do not amount to anything, and can be simply ignored. You cannot undo four hundred years of history by a majority vote at two parish meetings. On the other hand, we must not let these wise words of caution be used for the purpose of obscuring the issue, and preventing anything from being done.

What is needed right away is a lot more hard, earnest thinking; careful, accurate statement of facts; and thorough technical knowledge of theology. By theology, I do not mean out-of-the-way and hid-in-a-corner minutiae of ancient controversies: I mean accurate technical knowledge of the great fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith, viewed as Catholic, that is, the faith of the whole Church; and specifically, knowledge of those doctrines more stressed in other communions than our own. Each of us has a part of the whole truth—but not the whole, so long as we insist upon ruling out, or refusing to understand, that part some other group holds. For example, perhaps I personally have never taken the doctrine of justification by faith as seriously as one of my Lutheran colleagues has been accustomed to take it. Well, then, it is my plain duty to steep my mind in that doctrine until I can see how it relates to the whole Christian faith, as a Lutheran views it; to look at it from the inside, so to speak, as he looks at it. So with my Presbyterian brother's understanding of church polity, or my Calvinist brother's doctrine of election, or my Roman Catholic brother's view of transubstantiation. Incidentally, it will certainly enrich my own "understanding of the truth as it is in Christ," to do this; but that is not the main purpose—the main purpose is to share in and help along the reunion of the Christian Church, to bind up and to heal the old but still bleeding wounds in the mystical Body of Christ, His Bride, His Church.

Reunion will not be accomplished by fiat, or by ignoring differences, or by a mere counting of votes. It is still a hard job ahead of us, if the reunited Church is to be truly the Church of Christ, the one, holy, Catholic, apostolic Church we profess to believe in, in the Creed, and not some mere human association of like-minded persons interested in good works and devoted to social reform. Though let us not scorn even that conception of the Church! It is good as far as it goes; only, it does not go far enough, and we want nothing less than the full conception of the historic Church of Christ. We want no minimum definition or ideal, but the maximum, for it is heavenly treasure we hold in our hands. Woe unto us if, even with the best of intentions, we so bungle the task today that men shall look back upon us in generations to come and say, "You wasted the heritage that was rightfully ours as well as yours; our lives might have been richer, our faith more confident, our access to God more real, if you had not been in so much of a hurry!"

Another practical step we must all take is to study carefully the statements and proposals that have been made of late—concrete, definite pro-

posals and statements, which should be as familiar to every man going into the ministry today as his church history or—I almost said!—his Bible. Take the reports of Oxford and Edinburgh, and the volume entitled *Convictions* (edited by Leonard Hodgson), the new report, *Doctrine in the Church of England*, and the much briefer *Doctrinal Statement* of the Church of Scotland, for example; and there are several others. These books should be “read, marked, learned, and inwardly digested” by every one of us. If we really wish to share in the ecumenical movement, as I am sure we do, then let our preparation for sharing in it be intelligent and informed. Sporadic efforts may help; but concerted, continued, and, above all, well-planned efforts are the kind that are called for if we are to make our enthusiasm and our energies count most effectively.

2

The way of renewal in worship is one of the most vital factors of the whole area of Christian life and work today. It is no passing fad of the hour, but the expression of a deep hunger and thirst for God, felt by multitudes of men and women, and not least by those who are their spiritual leaders. From Dean Willard Sperry's *Reality in Worship* to Father Hebert's *Parish Communion*, the whole liturgical movement, in Protestant and in Catholic circles alike, has been marked by the note of reality. This means, in part, a return to the historic character of Christian worship—it is no mere psychological device for mutual or for self education. Its true criterion is not the subjective one of private or personal feelings—though quickened emotion is its natural accompaniment, if worship is real. Instead, it is addressed to an objectively real and living God—not to a congregation, however intelligent, appreciative, or responsive. And the true criterion is not the feeling-tone produced, as in a dimly lighted church with an altar ablaze with candles, but is rather the new life and strength that flow from it—not the repeated “Lord, Lord” of ecstatic fervor or exalted mood, but doing “the things that I say.” “By their fruits ye shall know” the reality of the communion with God which glows at the heart of a Christian man's walk with his Lord. “Did not our hearts burn within us as he talked with us in the way?”

Of course our worship should be as beautiful and rich and finished as we can make it. In the Talmud we read that “even the pagans offer no blemished sacrifice to their gods.” And at the high points in their worship, their temples, Phidias's glorious statue of Athena on the Acropolis, the world-

famous head of Zeus at Olympia—these were exquisite as human art could make them. Even the very hairs on the head of Athena, high aloft where, once the statue was erected, no human eye should ever again see them, but only the gods, "who see everywhere"—the hairs of her head were perfect. And in medieval cathedrals, even the backs of reredoses, and the details of clerestory windows, which only God and His angels and the glorified saints should ever see, were wrought in utter sincerity: the Church was the house of God, and must be perfect, from footing to spire. And must not our worship be equally sincere, and as beautiful as we can make it, as addressed to the same God? Shall we be less devout than pagans, or than our ancestors in those dim, far-off days of the twelfth to fourteenth centuries?

By this same token, then, let our worship be as beautiful as we can make it, as rich and full of meaning, as fitly matched to the perennial and fundamental needs of the human spirit, and as worthy an offering to the God of truth, of beauty, and of goodness, as it lies in our power to make it. We ought to experiment in worship, of course; but the experimentation of an expert is one thing, and that of an amateur quite another. After all, worship is an art, and has a history behind it. Men have been worshiping God since the days of the old Stone Age—perhaps longer. There are traditions in the art of worship, as in every other noble and worthy art. We do well to master these, before we experiment too freely. The improvisation of a Bach at the court of Frederick is a thing of beauty and a joy for ever; but we have heard other improvisations, and they have not impressed us! I commend to any man, therefore, who is interested in this movement to renew and revitalize public worship, the careful study of the great classic liturgical works in Christian history—Roman, Eastern, Lutheran, Anglican, Reformed, and Free Church; yes, and Jewish as well, and even some others. Take a book like Heiler's, on *Prayer*, for a guide; or Evelyn Underhill's new book on *Worship*; and steep your mind and soul in the Great Tradition! Many a day of joyful and rewarding study will be yours; many a fresh idea for your own services; and much new vitality in the worship of your own congregation, addressed week by week, and indeed offered daily, to the Eternal God whom we His creatures and His kin present to Him with uplifted hearts and voices. Nor let us neglect such a book as Noyes' *Prayers for Services*, where treasures have been gathered from everywhere and placed at our disposal.

More should be made of the Bible in public worship. I mean the "Authorized Version," so-called—"Appointed to be read in churches," and

at least so designed, whether ever actually "authorized" or not. The Bible ought to be used more, rather than less, in our services; but it should be used selectively, and appropriately; and it should be properly read, not declaimed, or read falteringly and with no understanding of either its message or the glorious rhythmic prose in which that meaning is clothed. There is a vast difference between reading the Bible worshipfully and reverently and unto edification, and just reading it, as one would read out a set of Sunday notices, or a page from any other book. The proper reading of Scripture is one of the most important means of "ministering grace to the hearers," and should be given earnest and careful preparation by every "leader in public worship" who means truly to be a "minister of God's Word."

3

The Christian social hope is the third outstanding emphasis in this new era in the Church's "way of renewal." There has always been a social hope at the heart of the Church's message, even in dark, depressing times; even when flamboyantly apocalyptic and other-worldly, and with "hearts in heaven" to the extent of spurning all earthly joys; and even when asceticism and world-renunciation seemed to cut the nerve of social action, there was always some reference to the hope of better things in the here and now, in the old world of man's sin and disobedience, penalized and cursed by Adam's fall. Not all voices were unanimous. Some looked for "a better city, a heavenly"; but others for a city here, "which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." And at the highest pitch of apocalyptic enthusiasm—or of hope battling with despair—the "holy city, new Jerusalem," which is above, was seen to descend to earth, and "come down from God," and take the place of the old battered and desecrated town on Zion's hill. Even world-renunciation had its ethics, and no one could hope for heaven whose hands were defiled by injustice or fraud, or had withheld bread from the poor and needy. "Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord? Even he that hath clean hands and a pure heart!" It is this *ethical* character of the Jewish-Christian religion of the Bible that most clearly distinguishes it from all others—from some in kind, from others in degree; and it is this *ethical* quality that makes it from first to last, whether explicitly or implicitly, a gospel of social hope.

Let me explain what I mean, for I think what I have just said has a far-

reaching implication for the social hope, and for the social gospel, at the present day; and if what I said is true, then it is certainly important.

The religion of the New Testament does not stand alone. It does not burst upon the world all of a sudden, like some *nova* before the eyes of the astonished astronomer. It is not "fatherless and motherless, without generation." There is newness enough in it: but it is the newness of the culmination and completion of a long process of "preparation for the gospel." It has a long history behind it, and can be fairly understood only in terms of, or against the background of, that long history. You can never divorce the New Testament from the Old, and have a complete unit, a finished picture, a perfect structure left—Hitler and his anti-Semite rabble notwithstanding. That is equally the mistake of a Jewish scholar like Klausner (though with more justification for him), and of some Christian writers, who set the New Testament off by itself and say the Christian ethic is impracticable, or, much the same thing, nihilistic and revolutionary. As Klausner put it, Jesus has no guidance to offer the judge on the bench, faced with concrete problems that arise in a tangled society of actual human beings engaged in the business of the world, earning their living, owning property, with wives and children to support, clothe, and educate, and an ordered civil or political society to maintain. His only counsel is: "Sell all you have, and give alms"; or, on a question of inheritance, "Man, who made me a judge or divider over you?"—words which, nevertheless, as Klausner should have recognized, are quoted from the story of Moses, the supreme prophet and law-giver of Judaism. Some Christian writers interpret the New Testament as if Jesus' prophetic utterances were a complete code for civil society, and could be applied—or were meant to be applied—to the state of things which now prevails in the world. (In truth, they were far *easier* of application in Jewish society of the first century in Palestine, than in our half-pagan, half-Christian "civilization" of the twentieth!) As a consequence, the gospel is interpreted as a system of social radicalism, dangerous, but divinely inspired and therefore infallible if applied. The only difference between this view and the medieval scholastic doctrine of the *nova lex* is that the gospel, taken alone, is seen to be radical, not conservative; and that the schoolmen wove some of the Old Testament into their pattern. But the whole current presupposition is wrong, and has always been wrong, whenever it has been assumed. The Early Church, I mean the very *earliest* church, in Jewish Palestine in the days before Paul, regarded itself as the New Israel, and the gospel as

the crown and completion of the law. True, Jesus had criticized and reinterpreted the law, on some points. The Sabbath, for example, He regarded far more liberally than did the scribes. The observance of fasting He and His disciples definitely disregarded, as also the pious custom of ablution before meals, and other current religious practices. But the law, in its fundamental moral and social aspects, still held good—it was reinterpreted, in the sense of a deepened ethical application, but it still held: recall, for example, His interpretation of the rules concerning oaths, marriage, revenge, in the Sermon on the Mount. Now to take the sayings of Jesus on love of enemies, non-resistance and nonresentment, the care of the poor, and the duty of disciples as witnesses in an alien world, as if these were the whole of the gospel, and stood alone and apart, and were meant for a code to govern society—that is the most erroneous and perverse kind of interpretation. Those counsels hold good; but they hold good within a society which is dedicated to the observance of the law of God, as set forth in the Old Testament, not in a society where rules of the jungle prevail, where each man seeks his own good, and not his neighbor's, and God is never so much as thought of in relation to civil society and its obligations. Judaism was a *church*, founded as a church, a religious society; it was not "as the nations round about." Jesus' people belonged to a Covenant with God; they were "a peculiar people," chosen and consecrated and committed to the fulfillment of the sacred law, from birth to death. And the social idealism, the very social conceptions, that inform the prophets and influence the law, were still dominant in Jesus' world—first-century Jewish Palestine.

Let me illustrate what I mean. The Book of Proverbs opens with an appeal to abstain from blood, to avoid the company of robbers—highwaymen!—who "lurk privily for the innocent" and "fill their houses with spoil"; for the end of these bandits is their own self-destruction. This is good advice—we are only surprised that it should seem necessary; though we recall that even in the *Mishneh Torah* of Maimonides, as late as the twelfth century, it is directed that no Jew is to sharpen the weapons of a Jewish robber! But this is not the whole point of the advice. The tremendous thrust comes later;

"So are the ways of every one that is greedy of gain;

It taketh away the life of the owners thereof"

—*both* the original owners, and the freebooters who treat commerce as a rough-and-tumble game, and the devil take the losers. There is your social

gospel, in the Bible of Jesus and His Apostles, in a writing that does not reflect the law a hundred per cent, but certainly in this respect echoes the humanitarian provisions of the sacred code. It is no tirade against "the profit motive," for without the profit motive there would be no commerce, no industry, no "civilized" life at all: a fact as patent as when Thucydides sketched the beginnings of the highest civilization he knew, that of Greece before the Civil War. We tend to ignore it; but then we have fallen into the habit of decrying the social order, without pausing to consider what sort of workable substitute we have to offer, were we suddenly called upon to take over human society and manage it, feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and provide jobs for all. And note how the author goes to the roots of the problem in one phrase: "greedy of gain." There is the ethical—or unethical—source of our trouble. Not the profit motive, but the *uncontrolled* profit motive; the bland assumption that anyone will do anything whatever for a consideration; and that whatever a man does may be excused, if we only recognize the factor of his own gain or advantage in what he does. That is the curse, not of "capitalism," but of *any* system—capitalist, socialist, or communist—in which "greed for gain" blots out all consideration of human welfare, the rights of the individual, and the well-being of the whole social group.

It was out of the Old Testament that the New flowered and bore its rich fruit. It was out of Judaism that Christianity was born; and the first witness of the Church was that it represented the New or the True Israel—in which all the promises and commandments of God were "Yea." The genuine "social gospel" is not a one-sided individualistic, atomistic, nihilistic interpretation of certain selected sayings of Jesus; rather it is the whole message and spirit of Jesus as correcting, crowning, and fulfilling the religion and ethic of Judaism—an ethic and a faith which is "social" through and through, and sees human life to be satisfying only when it is lived in harmony with the revealed will of God. Jesus' ethic is no code for civil society—not if taken in isolation from its whole background and presupposition of Judaism. But taken historically, and in close relation to the religious-social ethic of the Old Testament, it is the highest and the most practical way of life for man upon earth, and the only way, I believe, out of the impossible situation in which the world finds itself today. The Church's task, as I conceive it, is not to rebuild the structure of society, to bring in a new social order, political, economic, and international; but to remotivate the lives of men. Its task is still to teach ethics: in the old language, to "convert" men, to "save souls."

The Church and the Worshipping Man

JAMES H. STRAUGHN

I WRITE as a religionist, not altogether unacquainted with the tenets of the schools, but more familiar, by practical experience and studious application, with the problems of the human spirit. I feel that final knowledge cannot be found in the schools, where no final tests revealing spiritual IQ's or PQ's can be discovered; and that no set of rules can ever be set up which will displace or liquidate the simple adjustments which may be made in human nature, and which through the years have brought forth new creatures—a new creation in Christ Jesus our Lord. The ultimate adjustment is redemption, the final arbiter; not in an attempted complacent rearrangement of habits, or wills or skills, or in the economic rearrangement of human affairs, but in a readjustment of personality under the benign and benevolent love of God. These others may and will aid. My authority is that of one who is not unacquainted with the travail of man's soul and the alchemy of the love of God; with the sorrows and hurts which afflict mankind and the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world.

This worshipping man, this man on his knees, as a religionist I therefore am acquainted with, and I am conscious that I know what to do with him. For the worshipping man is a God-seeking man, and to relate God and man becomes the particular task of Christian people.

Is it, then, asking too much that you accept with me three basic assumptions?

1. That God is the primary fact in the world.
2. That man's primary duty is to get himself rightly related to God.
3. That the primary business of the Church is to effect this relationship.

I lay down these basic ideas not to involve you in a syllogism or even to prove a case for myself, but because they make clear my own conception of this worshipping man—what he is after and how he may realize his desire. And I am sensible of the fact that each of these basic notions needs interpretation. There would be wide disparity in their elaboration were they submitted to a Council of Religions or even to a group of Ecumenical Christians. They give us, however, a discussional basis.

1. *God is the primary fact in the world.* The worshiping man is dealing first of all with the fact of God; there is no other meaning as to worship. Whatever his impulses or reasons, whatever the origins of his worship—fear or awe or praise—it is yet the matter of voicing his gratitude, making his prayer, offering his sacrifice, yielding his spirit, surrendering his mind, all to a Supreme Being, personal and reachable. It may be to appease His wrath, to placate Him. It may be to secure release from the thralldom of sin and of conscious wrong. It may be out of adoration. It may be deliverance from storm, strife, hunger, sorrow, defeat, death. Whatever it be, however it may arise, whether out of the figment of his own imagination, the creation of his own wit, or the intriguing, unerring, homing instinct of his unborn soul; this much is true—the worshiping man has God in mind. He may not have come to Him as a first choice, his driven soul may be responsible, but he comes to God as a final resort. He may have tried and probably did try every other device, but he knows if God fails nothing is left, for all other resorts have been exhausted. He therefore reaches out his arms, he is silent or vocal as his emotion allows; he bends the knee, he surrenders. For the moment, at least, he is God's man.

I do not here press the Christian conception of God, that may come later, but the fact remains that his conception of God will greatly qualify the nature of his worship; what he may say, or ask for, or vow; what service later he may render, what traits of character show; how he may act with reference to himself or his fellow men; what his hope of life may be or his expectancy of what may come. From Galsworthy's *Forsyte Saga* this little incident:

"Jolly looked at his father. 'Do you believe in God, Dad? I've never known.'

"At so searching a question from one to whom it was impossible to make a light reply . . .

"'What do you mean by God?' he said; 'there are two irreconcilable ideas of God. There's the Unknowable Principle—one believes in That. And there's the Sum of Altruism in man—naturally one believes in That.'

"'I see. That leaves out Christ, doesn't it?'

"Jolyon stared. Christ the link between those two ideas. Out of the mouths of babes! Here was orthodoxy scientifically explained at last."

Yes, here are the extremes in God conceptions. Much lies between. But whatever the origins, or the philosophy of God, I must leave such discussion to the schools. The great fact remains—it is the simple fact of the

primacy of God. That beyond God there is the eternal blank; that in front of God, all things else possess or lose their meaning.

2. *Man's primary duty.* Since God is the primary fact in the world, man's primary duty is to relate himself to that fact; and in doing so has basically related himself to every other order of truth in the world. The fact of his own limitations, physical, mental and spiritual, will forever deny him the perfection of that divine relationship. Sin, error, disease, ignorance, environment will beyond doubt do their full duty to every man. He is the victim of his own finiteness. We glimpse this in the reluctant statement of Jesus—"I have many things to say unto you but ye cannot bear them now." Einstein, being asked on an occasion to explain the theory of relativity, replied, "You have to know a great deal before I can explain it to you." But whether privileged or underprivileged, in fortune or out of luck, there remains always this primary adjustment. A circle is often represented as a symbol of completeness or fullness, and there can be only one center. Anything other can only be off center, which is to develop an eccentric, and man's whole life is out of balance. There is too much of law and order in our world for us ever to deny that it is centered in something; to attempt to think through such a world without reference to its primary fact is only to develop explanations and relationships which are not based in essential truth, and for a worshiping man to be looking for other expedients than God is only to miss the mark. Dr. Alexis Carrel feels the time has come for science to make more extensive inquiries in the study of man. He is exactly right, but if he thinks man is to be discovered, taking man as he is, as a total creature, through pure scientific exploration, without giving consideration to that which religion holds to be the highest manifestations of personality, we must with great admiration for that man express our pessimism. And in such research the highest and finest types of personality the world has produced, as expressed in our highest forms of living, and indeed the supremest of all, Christ Jesus, must be analyzed; and in doing this to have entered into that life—for "this is life eternal, to know Jesus Christ." Life then is to be measured in terms of God.

3. *The Church is the agency of that relationship.* The Church is organized religion. Without it the worshiping man would be at a decided disadvantage. It would be vain to say that without organized religion, and with it revealed religion, he has no other approach to God and that the God idea is contingent upon the Church. That, of course, is not so. The idea of God is as widespread as man himself and has been present with him from the dawn

of time, or certainly so far as we have any record of time. But the Church, or organized religion, has for its main task this matter of effecting relationship between God and man, either to create it or to foster it, as the case may be. Its authority is rooted in God. To it has been committed this responsibility and it is the sole agency. The type of organization as such may be man-made, but the institution itself is divine. Through it God may speak with clarity or hardly, a man may reach out with certainty or with difficulty, since the type of organization is human, but it is God-inspired nevertheless. Not to be able to say with all assurance, "Thus saith the Lord," is to admit it is not a church and to lose that reverence for it which is so essential to the worshiping man in his quest for God. The technique through which the Church may operate is subject to many contingencies—the race, the nation, the time; the social, political, or economic conditions; the esthetic, cultural and educational opportunities of the people; the tenets, doctrines and convictions of its adherents—all of these and more are a part of that form and character which a church may espouse in getting through to the man who wants God as the fulfillment of his quest. There are many types of organized religion, many forms of approach, but each lays down its code of devotion and admission. But in all of them the dominant purpose and effort is to make possible this meeting between man and his Maker. It may be through penitence and suffering, such as is so often pictured of holy men in the East. It may even take the form of personal sacrificial death. Men may climb poles, secrete themselves from the world, lay hold of life through faith, or enter into an ephemeral mental atmosphere—but all of it with the thought that this is the way to God.

These three basic assumptions are subject to varied and diverse interpretations.

There is the Christian interpretation—that God is in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, and this differentiates Christianity from all other faiths and religions. No matter what the Christian denomination—Catholic or Protestant—this is its basic truth and to all men it holds out this identical assurance.

There is the Catholic tradition that the Catholic Church itself becomes God's agent, the visible perpetuation of the authority of Christ in the technique of bringing man and God together.

There is the Protestant conception, which denies the assertions and claims of the Roman Church and says that reconciliation between God and man is

a matter strictly between God and man, without mediary other than Christ Himself in His sacrificial and redemptive character.

There is the Evangelical idea, wherein the Church as an organization is secondary to the kingdom of God on earth and is not of necessity identical with it. Its authority therefore is to point to the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world; it is God's agent only in so far as its people are in happy fellowship with God and doing His will; through faith in Christ man may come to know himself a child of God, having the witness in himself that he is born again. His loyalty to support the church is simply the test of his sincerity and exacts no duty beyond the implications of the acceptance of Christ as his Saviour. This is true universality. It is not a demand to accept any one church as the only true type of Christianity. It is simply the repetition of the demand of God himself—no more, no less. All that Jesus ever said was, "Follow me." We take Him in His divine character, to be sure; that is our faith. We accept Him in His mighty acts, in His crucifixion, His resurrection, His gift of the Spirit—all of that is a part of accepting and following Christ. It is not a close corporation. It is easy to be a churchman, that is to say, to join the church. It is not so easy to be Christian. Backsliding may be our tradition, but that is simply the filtration process whereby the unworthy go back to their own.

The method or technique of one age may succumb to the type of another age without the surrender of its essential character. It may be that this supreme matter of bringing people to God, at which we have been more adept than in keeping people near God—which was an easy thing to the fathers—has become somewhat of a mystery to this age, and yet all of us are quite sensible to the fact that our supreme business is the same. People everywhere are saying that what the world needs is God, though many of those in high places who say it are not indicating it by their example. But why should we look for inspiration for this outside the churches? Let judgment begin with the house of God.

In applying itself to this task there are the two major methods or techniques; the one traditional—evangelism; the other, in process—Christian education. In dealing with this seeker after God, we must be able to say something to him other than indulging in the terminology of a day that has gone and holding out nothing but weary platitudes which have lost their meaning. There is still abiding, however, the same truth which we have been blinking

for years; the fact of sinner and sin and the need of penitence and forgiveness if one is to find God. This primary conception of our task is not of the schools, they know nothing about it; yet it lies at the very heart of the problem of this worshiping man. This is a preacher's and a layman's task. "O that I knew where I might find him," cries the worshiper, and who is to point the way save those who themselves have trod the toilsome road! Is this an outmoded and forgotten method? It is the only way we know. It is not an ethical approach. Culture and refinement are but dross. Place and importance are of no avail. "Ho," cries Everyman, "this is the only power I know," as he flips a coin in the face of the toiler. "And these," embracing his property, "shall go with me on that lone pilgrimage." "Nay," laughs Mammon, "I go not." And in the sacred book—"This night thy soul shall be required of thee." No, not here, not there, but in the consciousness of his sin, Everyman realizes at last that only God is left, and he cries out for mercy. How to face men with their sin, to declare "Thou art the man"; if anything characterized our fathers it was their desperate conception of man's sin, the awfulness of it, the horror, the shame! And we may as well admit it, the awfulness of sin and wrongdoing have been so toned down in our day that the distinction between the sinner and the saint has almost disappeared. We have refined our sins to that extent. I speak as a preacher and a close observer of preachers. But I know that through this business of preaching, by this man of God, fired with the message hot off the altars of God, has been ordained the way of reconciliation and life.

But a major question remains. What shall become of the worshiping man after he is got! That also is the additional concern of the Church, whose business it is not only to effect a relationship between God and man but to aid the worshiping man in the development and expression of that new relationship. In this respect most Protestant churches up to now, or certainly until very recently, can claim but little distinction. We have urged this union between God and man, compelling and exhaustive, or, as we have been saying, received him into the Church. But after that we have dealt with him without much additional concern; he is a sort of finished product and under the grace of God supposed to be able to look after himself. Well, in the days when we got him in the method of evangelism alone, whatever spiritual culture came afterward was found by the wayside, where alas, feeding usually was poor. All we may claim of spiritual direction has been fortuitous and experimental. There are as many ideas as to form, ritual, orders of service, procedure, equip-

ment, programs, architecture, as there are persons concerned. It may be that out of the trial and error method something definite and permanent may come. But in this respect there are two considerations which must be remembered and protected. First, the protection of the major message; otherwise we shall run into the same hazards as bedevil many faiths, with so much form and circumstance that the essential message gets lost in attempts at beauty and pleasing performance. The message of necessity must condition and qualify every decision. The second hazard is that of attempting so to regiment worship as to deny those latitudes which are the definite right of the man to express his faith after his own need—his freedom and his liberty as a child of God. To an extent these hazards condition each other, since our faith is of that individualistic type—set free by the power of God. But build an ecclesiasticism we must. We are dealing with new cultural standards and codes and they must be satisfied in any arrangement made, since ecclesiasticism is but a human device made after the manner and customs of people at any given time. Others may claim divinity for their ecclesiastical type but evangelicals deny any such authority, either scriptural or historical.

For the most part man worships through his church and he has a right to expect genuine help from the church. If it isn't there he has a right to look for it where it may be had. For this reason, certainly in the Protestant world, there will always be the necessity for different types of churches, with different appeals to satisfy the varying temperaments of people. On the assumption that Protestantism has something distinctive to offer, its first exhibit is the man who is in its pulpit. His training, his outlook, his personality, all are of first importance. Whether it should or should not be so, it is a fact that Protestantism makes or breaks just here. In liturgical churches it makes much less difference. The form, the ritual, every important motion and gesture have been devised for him and the minister may be only a skilled guide, voicing such things as have been drilled into him to get his church's message through. No such performance is of value in Protestant churches. But even this may become necessary if we lose the skills of direct witnessing, and it may be that at least a part of the struggle for symbolism and procedure is born out of desperation; that men have forgotten how to lead people to God, rather than that the old technique has failed. We have lost the key and do not know how to open the door. But the training of this man in worship ideas and ideals; how to make services and develop atmospheres; how to build a program; to know and to be able to put into execution the principles of religious education;

to supervise the spiritual layout of his church—these are most essential, and secondary only to his “Thus saith the Lord.”

That a program of religious education is of compelling importance in a church needs no defense. All that is at risk just now is the overenthusiasm of its proponents. In the first flush of enthusiasm it very definitely ran head-long into the old technique and overstated its case, thus bringing itself with many sane people into more or less disrepute. Religious education can never displace evangelism and its values, and by evangelism I mean the direct preaching or witnessing to sinful men to get right with God through the confession and forgiveness of their sins—even at an altar rail, if there be such. Nor is this to deny the values of the local church program. Many of the people we try so desperately to reach in maturity could have escaped much had we given them the proper attention while they were young, and the preacher would have been saved much heartache as well. Years ago I sat out under the stars with a dear minister friend who since has gone to dwell among the stars. We were discussing our own spiritual affairs, how and when we were converted. It was a precious moment and I can never forget what he told me of himself; that he had never known a day when he was not a Christian; that in his childhood his mother had kept it clear in his mind that he belonged to God. In Harris's *Basis of Theism* there is the suggestion, not without foundation, that God's original plan before Eden's default was that children should grow into godliness as gradually and unconsciously as they might grow into full physical and mental stature. It is not yet too late to apply the skill of “Train up a child in the way it should go,” and to develop habits of thought and practice never to be surrendered. This is not the denial of the old method, it is but correlative and supplementary, but it is a technique and a method which we should follow. All that is involved, such as skilled workers and programs and attitudes, the church should provide. But I would like to give emphasis to the matter of the curriculum, and this to include a Catechism—Child-centered, Bible-centered, God-centered. Since all are concerned no single “Center” apart from the others can avail. All are involved. And further, since even the psychological principles employed in secular education have not altogether demonstrated their validity, if we are to judge by the product, we need not be in haste as to the adoption of the advice of the latest-speaking school. This curriculum should represent not simply the mind and the will of the editor. He is an interpreter of a whole church and the Articles of Reli-

gion cannot be forgotten. His own will is not the arbiter nor is he the one who should adventure into far fields. That prerogative belongs elsewhere. There is only one way for a church to establish its own message in religious education, and that is through this curriculum. Which leads me a bit further on to say what I please about Christian education in our colleges and universities. There is only one major reason for the Church to be in the secular educational field, and that is, to do something not being done in state and nonchurch institutions. And that one thing is to keep the matter of religion not only in chairs, and in personal character, and in loyalties and in atmosphere, but in the curriculum as well. We have been desperately afraid to do this. Is God the world's primary fact, transcending in importance and in certainty every other fact, no matter what the field? Why, then, this timidity? Does anyone suppose that in the field of secular education the Church can ever compete with the State or privately endowed institutions? Unless we are putting in what the others are leaving out we are simply wasting good money, and this without in any way minimizing the value and importance of pure education. The danger is imminent always lest the question of the open mind get more attention than the question of the pure heart; so much so that the temptation of educators is to go elsewhere if the Church does not financially produce—which is to say that it is more important to train the mind than to seek God, and the two are not synonymous. So in this matter of religious education, wherever exhibited, let its primary motive be to relate people to God and, following a good fashion, let them have the conscious joy and satisfaction of knowing they are in that heavenly relation.

But I like to think of our evangelical faith, not as one faith among many, doing only a phase of ministry for mankind, but as a great catholicity, wherein there is room for all men, of all races, and all climes to work out with fear and trembling their own salvation. Our gospel is just that. Our invitation is just that. Whosoever will, let him; in the confidence that in every congregation, including every person sitting in it, the invitation means just what it says. If it is freedom, with little restriction other than one's own faith in Christ, let him sit down or get up as the occasion may warrant. If his desire is to be happy and give his testimony, by all means let him speak. If it is decorously to sit in lovely buildings, amid the suggestiveness of symbol and phrase, with heavenly music flooding his soul, let there be fullest provision for that rapturous moment. If it is to possess the happy fortune of being a

prophet of God and to have all his very own, a pulpit and a loyal people, God be praised, and let the man speak as the Spirit gives him utterance. So shall yearning, hungry, aspiring, heaven-bound pilgrims lift up holy hands, bend the knees, and be possessed of God.

"I heard it all, I heard the whole
Harmonious hymn of being roll
Up through the chapel of my soul
And at the altar die,
And in the awful quiet then
Myself I heard, Amen, Amen,
Amen I heard me cry!
I heard it all and then although
I caught my flying senses, Oh,
A dizzy man was I!
I stood and stared; the sky was lit,
The sky was stars all over it,
I stood, I knew not why,
Without a wish, without a will,
I stood upon that silent hill
And stared into the sky until
My eyes were blind with stars and still
I stared into the sky."

"O come let us worship and bow down, let us kneel before the Lord our Maker."

The New Testament Conception of the Church

ABDEL ROSS WENTZ

WHAT is the New Testament conception of the Church? We may all start from that question. Not all of us will stop there. Some of us will ask also what does Christian history under God's Spirit teach about the nature of the Church. But at least we may all *start* from the New Testament idea.

I

According to the New Testament the Church is *Christian*. It is centered in Christ. If we use the figure of a body, the Head of the Church is Christ. If we use the figure of a building, the Cornerstone of the Church is Christ. If we use the figure of a bride, the Bridegroom of the Church is Christ.

In the apostolic ideal Christ is the bond that binds Christians together in the fellowship which we call the Christian Church. At the very beginning the commanding idea in the formation of the Church was fellowship, fellowship under a Leader. That is something personal. The big end of it is not visible. It is not subject to the analysis of the theologian. It is not subject to the plumb-lines of Church polity. It is hidden. It is hidden communion of the disciples with their Saviour.

Recent research has taught us that we must guard against reading too much system and uniformity into the Church of the New Testament. What produced the Christian community in the first place was not a constitution and bylaws, not even a set of principles. It was the faith that pulsated in the hearts of the Christian disciples. That faith was not at first drawn from a body of sacred writings nor set down in the form of a creed. It was a rugged attachment, not reasoned out and not integrated with other emotions. It was simple personal trust in a Person, unquestioning devotion to a beloved personality who, they felt, had saved them from abysmal disaster and who, they believed, could lead them into abiding safety. That was the fountainhead of the Church's life.

Yes, the New Testament pictures the Church as Christian, as Christ-centered. That is clear not only from the Great Confession in Matthew 16 but also from many passages in the writings of Saint Paul and Saint John.

But this New Testament idea of the Church as a free pulsating fellowship centering in Christ has often been badly obscured. Today the times are ripe for the recovery of that idea, riper than they have been for centuries. For a long time now men have lived on systems and the bracing effect of them. For several generations past men have been enthralled by ideas and the splendor of them. Today, instead of ideas and systems and definitions, instead of programs and organizations, the centers of all great movements are personalities, leading personalities. To stand outside of the charmed circle of leaders today is to be homeless and unoriented. To stand within the magnetic influence of the central personality—that gives the simplest laborer heart and motion; it lifts his life from drudgery into thrilling devotion.

This new outlook, this change in the spiritual atmosphere, opens the way in our day for the New Testament idea of the Church. Because the New Testament Church was centered in the living presence of Christ it was not static but dynamic. It was governed entirely by the Holy Spirit of Christ. It had no fixed outlook. Much of its power was due to its ability to change from time to time in order to meet changing conditions. He who was the beating heart of the New Testament Church is the pulsating center of the Church in our day. He is not one who is weighted down with utilitarian programs. He is not one who binds yokes upon men. He is one who has loved and suffered and who still loves and suffers and yearns and woos—the great Leader of infinite power who would transform the world, not by force but by fellowship, not by formulas but by faith, not by logic but by love, not by programs but by personalities.

This Christian Church of the New Testament, this Christ-centered fellowship, we offer to the groping multitudes of the present world. It is plastic as the heart of youth. It is the Church of the *living* God. It has traditions that are living and vitalizing. It is kept eternally young by a living Presence, vitally alert and many-faceted as a versatile personality.

If Christians would minister salvage to a distracted world today, the New Testament suggests a Church pulsating with the heartbeats of Saviourhood, a charmed circle that offers fellowship with the great central Friend of the universe.

II

According to the New Testament the Church is *Holy*. It is set apart. It is "called out," ecclesia. It is different. It is high and lifted up.

For one thing, the Church is holy in its calling. The Church is of God. He called it into being. It belongs to God. It is therefore holy, as God is holy.

The individuals who constitute the Church may show many differences among themselves, differences of color and race and language, differences of faith and zeal and goodness. But at least one thing they have in common, and that is the fact that their faces are turned toward God. To be in the Church is to belong to God. The thing that brings Christians together into fellowship is the fact that they have all experienced redemption through God's grace. The Church is the fellowship of the sanctified and all the members of the Church can exclaim with Saint Paul: "It is God who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace." The Church belongs to God by its origin and calling. It is a divine institution, not merely a human society.

The Church is holy also because the Holy Spirit works in it. It is the special sphere of the working of the Holy Spirit. As Christ is the Head of the body all the members of the body do His bidding and are filled with His spirit, the Holy Spirit. When Saint Paul speaks in the benediction of "the communion of the Holy Spirit," he is thinking of the community of believers where holiness prevails because the members of the community harbor the Holy Spirit of their Head.

Jesus made explicit mention of the Church only twice, according to our records. In both instances the Church is set in opposition to sin and evil. "The gates of hell shall not prevail." "If thy brother sin . . . tell it to the Church." The clear implication is that the Church is holy. Christ required holiness of His followers. For this reason He entrusted His Church with the keys, the means of grace. The Holy Church has the Holy Scriptures, the Holy Sacraments, holy laws, holy teachings. The single aim of its acts and its teachings is to promote holiness, to increase righteousness.

The New Testament, however, does not represent the holiness of the Church as complete or perfect. There is the parable of the tares and the parable of the dragnet. Saint Paul repeatedly addresses his hearers as saints, and yet in the course of his letters admonishes them about their shortcomings

and sins. According to the New Testament the holiness of the Church is real but not complete, not yet fully attained. The Church is in actual process of being "cleansed from all sin." The Church looks forward in hope to the consummation when "Christ shall present it unto himself, a glorious Church, holy and without blemish." But that is in the future.

But the incomplete character of the Church's holiness does not make its holiness unreal. A city may be a rich city while some of its citizens are still poor. A school may be a learned school while all of its students are still short of the ideal in learning. The Church as a society on earth will never be complete in its holiness. None of its members are. Sanctification is a process. That is true of the collective body as it is true of the individual member. Holiness is progressive. It shall be perfect hereafter.

In the course of church history there have been many attempts to secure greater purity and holiness in the Church. And more than once these attempts have led to schisms in the body of Christ. However contrary to the New Testament, these efforts do testify to a deep underlying conviction that the Church must be holy.

Because the Church is holy, there must always be a state of tension between the Church and its environment. The Head of the Church protested against the low ideals of His day. He set His followers in uncompromising criticism of current culture. The Church is the conscience of society, and because the Church is holy, high and lifted up, it will always feel a tension between things as they are and things as they ought to be. When the Church in our day identifies itself with some secular system of economics or social propaganda, it abandons its New Testament character, because in the New Testament the Church represents the higher spiritual order. The Church is holy.

III

According to the New Testament the Church is *apostolic*. It is charged with a mission. To be a disciple, a learner confessing Christ, is to be an apostle, to stand under a special commission. And the mission of the disciples is the mission of the Church, as the acts of the members are the acts of the body.

The apostolic mission of the Church is to carry on the work of Christ Himself on earth. "As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you."

The Church according to the New Testament is not only the product of God's grace through Jesus Christ, but it is also an agency of God's grace,

the keeper of the keys to the Kingdom on earth. As the collective body of believers, in the fellowship of the means of grace, the Church is the appointed agency for the extension of the Kingdom of God and the salvation of men. The Church is taught to pray: "Thy Kingdom come" and to use its life and resources for the conversion of the world.

According to the New Testament the Church is equipped with the means of fulfilling its apostolic commission. For one thing, the Church is furnished with the truth that it must teach. It is "the pillar and ground of truth." The original Twelve were specially trained by intimate association with Christ to be His witnesses and they regarded this as their principal duty. They transmitted that duty to their successors. And the Church throughout history has accepted without question the apostolic succession of teaching and witnessing concerning Christ. In this it has continued the prophetic office of Christ Himself.

Another way in which the Church fulfills its apostolic commission is by fostering associated worship and transmitting the Sacraments. These social acts that help to mark the Church as a visible society are from the apostles. The apostolic Church is a worshipping Church through all ages. It presents Christ as mediator even now. And all the Christian liturgies of the centuries are the continuance of the priestly office of the great Head of the Church, and expression of the Church's apostolic character.

Then, too, the New Testament indicates that Christ committed to His immediate followers the exercise of discipline and the administration of affairs in the community of believers. There are widely different views as to details in this matter, but in general there is agreement among us that the Church to be apostolic must exercise some powers of discipline and government. In this the Church continues the kingly office of Christ.

As to this apostolic character of the Church, this aggressive propulsive quality, it needs to be emphasized that according to the New Testament it is of the essence of the Church and not merely of its well-being. Any group of professing believers that does not feel its apostolic commission to propagate the gospel and extend the Kingdom has not inherited the Spirit of the Founder of the Church.

It should be noted also that the new aggressiveness of the great non-Christian religions in our day calls for special emphasis just now on the apostolic character of the New Testament Church, its aggressive mission to its non-Christian environment.

IV

According to the New Testament the Church is *catholic*. It is universal, all-embracing. It possesses qualities, inherent qualities, that make it fit to be the home of all classes of men in all parts of the world and in all ages of time.

The Church is catholic because it is not limited as to place or time. And this idea of the Church as universal and timeless was not an afterthought. It is not true that the Church was at first only the group of Christians in a particular locality, and then when this little obscure group had expanded into a mighty enterprise the idea of a universal Church arose. The New Testament does not so represent it. From the beginning the Church was understood to be the entire community of the Kingdom, the larger incarnation of Christ, and the local congregation was simply a miniature of the whole. As a thousand different mirrors may at one and the same time reflect the rays of the shining sun, so the local congregations or churches are the reflections of the great Church universal. Every Church is a catholic Church unless it claims to be the only catholic Church. What we call the mystical conception of the Church as the body of Christ was present from the outset. It not only includes the believers and saints of all nations and places but it also extends backward and forward in time and includes the saints of the past as well as those of future ages.

The Church is catholic, not only because it is destined to endure through all time and to reach all nations, but also because it rises above the limitations of culture and religion. It is the only community that can meet the needs of all mankind. This is indicated not only by particular words of Jesus and individual passages in the New Testament, but also by the very nature of the teachings set forth. Jesus claimed that His gospel is sufficient for the needs of all mankind. Both Jesus and Paul taught with the background of Stoic philosophy and universal empire. They made universal claim for their gospel. They pictured the Church as the organ through which God will accomplish His plan not only for men but for the universe.

The Church is catholic because the God to whom the Holy Church belongs is a living God. He is a Spirit, always active and energizing, and always progressively revealing Himself. He reaches out in love toward every living soul. The Christian idea of God carries ecumenical implications for the Church. If God is a personal, living, energizing God, then His Church is not merely an international society binding people together from the four corners of the earth. It is more than that. It is an ecumenical community

bearing in its heart the propulsive power of a boundless love that will not stop until it embraces the whole world.

The Church of the New Testament is catholic because its message is a message of divine revelation and transcends all forms of religion and religiosity. Christianity is not a religion. Religion is *Man's* effort to adjust himself to the ultimates. Christianity is *God's* answer to the quest of the human heart. Jesus Christ is not the founder of a religion. The message of the New Testament Church is not simply one of several possibilities for man's pious self-expression. It stands alone as God's message to man. It is not just a word from God or a word about God; it is the Word of God whose content is Jesus Christ. The Church is catholic because it does not come with a philosophy, nor a system of doctrine, nor an ethic; it does not even come with a religion. It comes with a Person, a living God who speaks through Jesus Christ. Our God is larger than the founder of religion. Our gospel transcends religion as well as time and place. And our Church, so long as it is faithful to this witness, is the catholic Church.

V

According to the New Testament the Church is *One*. Now the unity of the Church is a subject of enormous proportions, and a whole library has grown up about it in recent years. We must content ourselves with a few remarks.

The chief New Testament sources of information about the unity of the Church are the high priestly prayer of our Lord and Saint Paul's letter to the Ephesians. From these we learn that the unity of the Church is a mystery. It is something in which we *believe*. It transcends human understanding.

As the Church itself is holy, not merely a voluntary association of men combining together to effect certain ends, so the unity of the Church is not merely an earthly visible manifestation devised by men in order to increase the efficiency of the Church and to present a so-called "united front." It is divinely ordained and belongs to the essence of the Church. The unity of the Church, according to the New Testament, arises from the unity of God, "as I and the Father are one." The Church is one because there is one Spirit, one Lord, one Father. The Church is one because all members of the Church are members of Christ and abide in Him as branches abide in the vine.

So the unity of the Church is not something in the golden past, a lost

treasure that needs to be recovered. It is not something in the rosy future, a high goal that needs to be achieved. It is something that exists now, and simply calls for fuller expression. It is something that was and is and is to be. It is as eternal as the Church itself. It is as eternal as the God who called the Church into being. It is something that belongs to the essence of the Church. The Church *is* one.

The source of this mystical unity of the Church is the redeeming work of Christ for men. It is not in a unified organization. It is not in a common liturgy. The unity of the Church grows out of a common faith, a common gospel that centers in the Cross. This and nothing else is the source of the creative power of the Church.

The New Testament also teaches that this invisible unity of the Church will express itself in outward and visible unity. It is to be a sign to the world: "That the world may believe." The efforts to achieve this outward unity of the Christian Church have engaged all the ecumenical councils of bygone ages and all the world conferences of modern times. We can only remark here that these efforts have good New Testament warrant and good New Testament example.

Finally, the New Testament represents the unity of the Church as a process, a growth. It is a present reality, but still imperfect. It cannot be hurried by the manufactured conceptions of men. Perfect unity will come as a growth in faith and in "the knowledge of the Son of God," a growth "into him in all things, which is the Head, even Christ." External means may be used to increase that faith and spread that knowledge, but the hurried establishment of any external union would hinder the true process and would check the real growth of unity.

The New Testament idea of the Church's unity brings two words of warning: first that our efforts at Church union should not degenerate into a trifling with something that transcends human comprehension; second, that if our witness to the world is to be effective, we dare not permit our love for our particular ideas and traditions to delay that growth of the unity which our Lord has in mind for His Church. To all of us the New Testament conception of the Church's unity suggests that since the Church *is* one, we should enter now with joy into a sense of real unity among us. We should allow our hearts to be thrilled with the joy that was in the heart of our Lord, as we emphasize continually the visible and invisible bonds of faith and hope and love that bind us together.

bearing in its heart the propulsive power of a boundless love that will not stop until it embraces the whole world.

The Church of the New Testament is catholic because its message is a message of divine revelation and transcends all forms of religion and religiosity. Christianity is not a religion. Religion is *Man's* effort to adjust himself to the ultimates. Christianity is *God's* answer to the quest of the human heart. Jesus Christ is not the founder of a religion. The message of the New Testament Church is not simply one of several possibilities for man's pious self-expression. It stands alone as God's message to man. It is not just a word from God or a word about God; it is the Word of God whose content is Jesus Christ. The Church is catholic because it does not come with a philosophy, nor a system of doctrine, nor an ethic; it does not even come with a religion. It comes with a Person, a living God who speaks through Jesus Christ. Our God is larger than the founder of religion. Our gospel transcends religion as well as time and place. And our Church, so long as it is faithful to this witness, is the catholic Church.

V

According to the New Testament the Church is *One*. Now the unity of the Church is a subject of enormous proportions, and a whole library has grown up about it in recent years. We must content ourselves with a few remarks.

The chief New Testament sources of information about the unity of the Church are the high priestly prayer of our Lord and Saint Paul's letter to the Ephesians. From these we learn that the unity of the Church is a mystery. It is something in which we *believe*. It transcends human understanding.

As the Church itself is holy, not merely a voluntary association of men combining together to effect certain ends, so the unity of the Church is not merely an earthly visible manifestation devised by men in order to increase the efficiency of the Church and to present a so-called "united front." It is divinely ordained and belongs to the essence of the Church. The unity of the Church, according to the New Testament, arises from the unity of God, "as I and the Father are one." The Church is one because there is one Spirit, one Lord, one Father. The Church is one because all members of the Church are members of Christ and abide in Him as branches abide in the vine.

So the unity of the Church is not something in the golden past, a lost

treasure that needs to be recovered. It is not something in the rosy future, a high goal that needs to be achieved. It is something that exists now, and simply calls for fuller expression. It is something that was and is and is to be. It is as eternal as the Church itself. It is as eternal as the God who called the Church into being. It is something that belongs to the essence of the Church. The Church *is* one.

The source of this mystical unity of the Church is the redeeming work of Christ for men. It is not in a unified organization. It is not in a common liturgy. The unity of the Church grows out of a common faith, a common gospel that centers in the Cross. This and nothing else is the source of the creative power of the Church.

The New Testament also teaches that this invisible unity of the Church will express itself in outward and visible unity. It is to be a sign to the world: "That the world may believe." The efforts to achieve this outward unity of the Christian Church have engaged all the ecumenical councils of bygone ages and all the world conferences of modern times. We can only remark here that these efforts have good New Testament warrant and good New Testament example.

Finally, the New Testament represents the unity of the Church as a process, a growth. It is a present reality, but still imperfect. It cannot be hurried by the manufactured conceptions of men. Perfect unity will come as a growth in faith and in "the knowledge of the Son of God," a growth "into him in all things, which is the Head, even Christ." External means may be used to increase that faith and spread that knowledge, but the hurried establishment of any external union would hinder the true process and would check the real growth of unity.

The New Testament idea of the Church's unity brings two words of warning: first that our efforts at Church union should not degenerate into a trifling with something that transcends human comprehension; second, that if our witness to the world is to be effective, we dare not permit our love for our particular ideas and traditions to delay that growth of the unity which our Lord has in mind for His Church. To all of us the New Testament conception of the Church's unity suggests that since the Church *is* one, we should enter now with joy into a sense of real unity among us. We should allow our hearts to be thrilled with the joy that was in the heart of our Lord, as we emphasize continually the visible and invisible bonds of faith and hope and love that bind us together.

"Spelling God With the Wrong Blocks"

GEORGE CLARK VINCENT

THE phrasing of my topic is taken from a letter of Edwin Arlington Robinson. "The world," he said, "does not seem to me to be a prison house, but a kind of spiritual kindergarten, where millions of bewildered children are trying to spell God with the wrong blocks."

I have an impression that this is a fairly accurate description of what is going on in a good many people's minds. There is a lot of bewilderment. People seem to be wanting a religion and groping toward religion more than has been the case for a long time. I question whether the number of those who find is equal to the number of those who seek, and I have a suspicion in my mind that the trouble in some cases is that we are trying to spell God with the wrong blocks.

I want to mention two types of approach to the idea of God which seem to me to fall under this description.

In the first place, it is a very common and familiar thing to try to work out our ideas of God from the idea of power. God is the being who made the world. God is the one who does and can do all things. One reason why the belief in miracles has entered so largely into religious thinking is because of this notion of God as a being of unlimited power. He can do anything.

I suspect this is a case of spelling God with the wrong blocks. I doubt very much whether we get any large amount of help with our spiritual problems, or intellectual problems, or our everyday situations from the implications of this point of view.

To begin with, this approach involves what the philosophers call the infinite regress. A little child asks us who made the world, or the stars, and we answer "God," and the little child very promptly and very logically says, "Well, who made God?" Logically it seems to me there is no answer to that question. If you try to tell who made God, then you can go on and ask, "Who made the maker of God?" and so on in this endless questioning for an ultimate maker. This is one difficulty with trying to spell God with the blocks of power.

But there is another one which I think is more serious. Inevitably it seems to me to involve us in a moral problem. If God has all power, why

does He allow so many wicked and unjust things to happen in this world? You will recall that the famous philosopher, John Stuart Mill, felt that problem very keenly. He was face to face with the sorrow and evil of the world. He went over and over and round and round these two positions—If He is all powerful, then He is not altogether good; and if He is infinitely good, then He surely must not be all powerful. I could tell you of more recent philosophers who have faced the same problem and come to the same conclusion. Either He is not all powerful, or He is not all good.

There is a second set of blocks with which people often try to spell God, which again seems to me to lead to rather unsatisfactory results. That is the attempt to think of God exclusively in terms of justice and moral goodness. There is a famous description of God which those of us who have been Presbyterians will remember. "God is a spirit, infinite, eternal and unchangeable in His Being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth." You will notice the well-known Presbyterian emphasis on moral righteousness as being the fundamental thing in the life of God. I was brought up on that and I am sure it has a good deal of truth in it, yet I find it an unsatisfactory way to approach the whole matter.

The trouble is in part that so much of the world does not seem to operate on the basis of justice. Steam and motive power do not seem to operate on that basis. The motor of my automobile occasionally fails to start, but I find it a little difficult to connect that failure with any particular moral delinquency on my part. It is quite as liable to misbehave on the days when I start off to make my sick calls in the hospitals, as on the days when I start off on much more questionable pursuits.

I have still another objection to the emphasis on moral goodness, and I write this rather diffidently, realizing profoundly how much the emphasis on right and wrong has meant for the development of civilization. There is, however, obviously some difficulty connected with this emphasis which has always tended to create the Pharisee, the self-righteous man who says, "Well, I have done nothing wrong. Why should I suffer as I do?"—or, "I have been a hard worker and earned my living and my position in society. Let other people do the same. Why should these unemployed make so much fuss in the world? Let them live as I have lived and they will be alright." It isn't a pretty disposition in the human spirit, but it is a very common one, and develops very easily, and I suspect it is rather encouraged by the insistence of God as primarily a God of moral character. We can find better blocks.

It is an old saying, worthy of serious consideration, that out of the mouths of babes and sucklings God has ordained praise. There are many things on which the judgments of young people are perverse and worthless. But they have a faculty of simple-minded direct approach to complicated problems which cannot be set lightly aside.

Not long ago I went to the young people in my own parish with the question, "What do you think God is like?" There were two or three simple presuppositions behind the question. The first of these presuppositions is that young people, sixteen, seventeen, eighteen years of age, often have had experiences of quite beautiful kind involving an immediate awareness of God's presence in the world. Here is a quotation from an essay written for an English master by a Montclair Academy boy: "My ideas on religion are simple—almost childlike; but I refuse to allow them to become complicated and cut-and-dried. Oftentimes, when I have been walking alone through a quiet forest or doing some solitary fishing along a cool mountain stream, I have felt the presence of God in the rustling of the wind through the tall treetops or in the steady murmuring of the water as it pours over the mossy stones at the bottom of the stream."

I am assuming that those words of a schoolboy are just as valid and significant in their way as Wordsworth's famous lines:

"A presence that disturbs me with the joy
Of elevated thought; a sense sublime
Of something far more deeply interfused,
Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
And the round ocean and the living air,
And the blue sky, and in the mind of man."

My second presupposition is that we get our knowledge of God not only from reasoning about Him but also that these direct perceptions can bring us back something of authentic tidings about the character of Him with whom our souls have to do.

With these presuppositions at the back of my mind I gave my young people the question, "What do you think God is like?"

To help them and to stimulate their minds, I made up a list of eight or ten words suggesting various pictures, asking them which of those pictures seemed to them most nearly to describe and fit their thought of the nature of God. Here is the list—A great Judge, a great King, a Tree, a Statesman working in a pioneer land like Washington with the colonies, and the early settlers

in California trying to build a state out of the riffraff of the communities; an Architect; a Weaver; a Watchmaker; a Housekeeping Mother; a Father; a Teacher. You may be interested in the results which came back. None of these young people thought that the idea of a great king meant anything to them in connection with their thought of God. One said that she thought God was like a housekeeping mother; two said He was like a great statesman working in a pioneer land, and one said that she thought He was like a watchmaker making a beautiful, ordered world. "Father" was pretty generally ruled out by these suburbanites—"all father does is to pay the bills." Most of those present thought that the element of a great judge entered into the picture in some fashion. But the words that seemed to catch their fancy most as coming nearest to suggesting the kind of picture they had in their minds of God were a *tree*, an *architect*, and a *weaver*.

I think that this is rather suggestive.

In the first place, you will notice that the emphasis is rather more on pattern, beauty and design than it is on moral goodness.

In the second place, these pictures get away from the conception of absolute power. The tree works with the muck and dirt in which it is set and makes out of them a thing of order, pattern and beauty; but it is in no sense an omnipotent thing able to do whatever it may choose. It has a definite character and works within certain limiting conditions, and it accepts the pain and toil and limitations imposed by those conditions.

So, too, the architect and the weaver—he accepts the materials that are given him, and while he works with a pattern and design of great beauty, it is limited and even determined to some extent by the materials that are handed to him with which to work. He accepts the limitations and toils to make beauty out of the disorder and assuagement that have been handed to him.

It would be easy to brush all this aside as the idle guesswork of a group of half-trained youths, but I think within limitations it has its importance.

First of all, it represents a different approach to the problem than that which many of us have been accustomed to use. I remember an essay which appeared a few years ago in a volume on *Religion Today*. After a page of sympathetic allusion to the problems and bafflements of youth this writer plunged into his subject by saying: "The place to begin is with the ultimate goodness of God." I wonder! I would have said the same a few months ago, I fancy. I have argued for that position many and many a time. I am begin-

ning to wonder whether I have been wasting my ammunition firing beside the mark. These young people begin not with the goodness of God, but with the spirit of toil and suffering that is among us, and within us. Is not our belief in God's goodness a matter of faith or of logic? These young people open their eyes and look. They see us baffled and hindered, till our lives are like the Hebrew youths in Daniel. But behold, they see another Being with us even in the midst of the fire and the furnace, and the form of this Other is like unto a Son of God.

In the second place, very obviously this is a point of view suggested by familiarity with the doctrine of evolution. Brought up as I was in the strictest sect, a Platonist, I find it hard sometimes to realize how little importance people of scientific education attach to the presence in the world of a great Knower and Sustainer of all things. Their interest is in an upward striving spirit in the world, and they do not always go on to ask questions about whence and whither, and to analyze the logical presuppositions of their faith. They will need those presuppositions some day, but those who talk the language of modern science would feel more at home with the conceptions of these young people than with the theologies in which most of us were trained.

In the third place, I think we might well recognize that this is a conception of God which fits in specially with the picture of Christ.

You remember the old missionary's story of the Chinese women who heard for the first time the story of Jesus as told to them by one whom they recognized as obviously a teacher of religion. One turned to another and said, "Didn't I tell you there must be a God like that?" She hadn't any great learning in philosophy or knowledge of the history of religious thought, but her heart instinctively responded to the story of Jesus as suggesting something profoundly related to the most intimate and complete conception that we could have of the nature and character of God.

Our ordinary thinking in religion has been muddled and mixed and perverted a good deal, I suspect, by elements which came from very different sources—arguments from design, questions of miracles, difficulties about the Book of Genesis, questions created very largely by the association of the thought of God with power, or perfect righteousness, or the management of life's external relationships. If we would sweep all of these out of our minds and go back to the story of Jesus and let it speak to our hearts, I wonder whether we would not agree with the Chinese woman that here is at least the beginning for a picture of the nature of God.

In the fourth place, I am attracted to this point of view because it represents one possibility of bridging the gap between the generally accepted attitudes of thousands of men and the practices of true religion. I do not delude myself by thinking this is a new emphasis. It has been tried many times. It has not yet brought the multitude into the confessionals. But it is closer to many modern points of view than much of traditional theology, and no one can contemplate the condition of modern man bereft of a firm religion without wishing to spin out one strand at least of what may some day become a cable and ultimately a bridge between the restless souls of modern people and their hope in God.

I do not think alone as I write of man's deep-seated need of the gloomy prognostications of a Bertrand Russell for a goalless world. I think much more of the symptoms we all see of an empty longing and a dissatisfied restlessness, which never can find rest until it rests in God. How much of the silly frivolity and pointless activity of modern men points back to inner emptiness. Most desperately men need God.

There will be some, of course, who will criticize this approach as being open to the same criticisms which made patri-passionism a heresy. I do not think we need be much disturbed by this.

There are three familiar aspects in the life of every personality. 1. He lives, first, as a dreamer of dreams and a conceiver of great purposes. His mind is in touch with the eternal. The Infinite works in his heart. 2. Next he sets out to realize his dream in the toilsome constructions of the world. He is often weary, constantly disappointed; yet in the very nature of his being there is this urge to self-realization, and his dreams are not merely dimmed, but also strangely vivified and glorified as he works them out in concrete form. 3. Then finally, when it is all over, and his toilsome work is done, there comes forth out of the dream and out of the imperfect (and toilsome) realization a third thing—a spirit which is that person's permanent contribution to the world and which takes all things that ever he thought or did and shows their meaning unto us.

In some such form as this I suppose all of us try to picture to ourselves from time to time the meaning of the great Christian mystery of the Trinity, which it is never permitted to mortal mind really to understand, but only to aspire to. We toil over it, but these young people go to the heart of the matter with a simple directness that rebukes us. The Divine who realizes Himself in toil is a familiar thought to them.

There is an instinctive tendency in the heart of man to shrink from struggle and to love security. We all know it. It is the genius, in some measure, of the suburbs. People come to Montclair and Greenwich and Scarsdale to get away from the dirt and disorder of Brooklyn, Newark and New York. It is the instinctive tendency of the parson. He looks ahead to the days when Lent and Holy Week and confirmation classes will be behind, and he can set his eyes on that trout stream in the hills, or that quiet nook in the garden, where he can rest and have an hour of peace. These things have their place. We know their lure, and yet I suspect that after all the experience of the years has yielded up its lesson we come back to say the most blessed hours have not been these at all, but rather the hours when we literally laid down our hearts that others might use them as stepping stones, and our minds that wayward feet might find a path—the hours when we have stood beneath the shadow of a great cross and said with the aged Whitefield—"I am weary *in* thy service, Lord—but not *of* it." We come home from our rounds of calls, our struggle to simplify and illuminate a great idea in a sermon, our endless and exhausting committee meetings, where we endeavor with all our patience to lift our parish—our community—a little nearer to the Divine Pattern; and we feel the most appropriate ritual in the whole field of religious devotion is not a meditation on the Infinite Goodness, but the old Roman Catholic liturgy of the Stations of the Cross.

Now if all this is true, and I think there is a good deal of reason to believe that this is somewhere near the trail of modern thinking, then I suspect that what I have been saying creates a sort of foundation for a type of religious education and home religion that will be a little different from that of half a century ago, but surely as appropriate to the truth of religion as the old-time forms ever were, and available for us today as those older forms were not. I grew up in a home where there were family prayers and a blessing at every meal. I like the memory of those family devotions, although I did not like the reality. I can remember being a good deal bored and a good deal irritated at times by the compulsion to join in the reading of a passage from the Bible every morning before I went to school, and taking time to kneel while my father led in prayer. The actualities of the practice were irritating, but the general significance and meaning of the practice have left a very deep impression on my life. I think of myself as a beneficiary of a sort of moral W.P.A. My father and mother were the moral taxpayers who created a fund of moral influence on which I have lived very largely through these years of my ex-

istence. The impression of the importance of and the devotion to things of the Spirit which the practice of family religion left upon my life were a real contribution, even though the actual exercises were sometimes irritating. I do not think it would be practical to try to revive that kind of home religion today.

Neither am I as happy as I might like to be with some of the substitutes that have been suggested. I have a friend, minister of a big church out in Michigan, who tells me that he has been developing a real movement in family religion in his parish by having a home shrine as a little family altar set up within the home, somewhere in the house, preferably in a quiet and not too conspicuous corner. Somewhere in this shrine there is a picture that carries a religious suggestion, and there from time to time individuals go to sit and think and pray, and there once or twice a week, perhaps on Sunday morning, the whole family gather while father or mother leads family prayers. It is a very beautiful picture. I wish very much that I could think it were practical. I am a little afraid that some of us would feel rather self-conscious, though if we could do it naturally and freely, it could be a beautiful custom in our homes.

But there is another kind of home religion that I think all of us could practice. And that is the association of the family with some piece of Christian service where we could feel that we are co-operating with this order-creating, beauty-imparting spirit that is struggling up through the sordid and difficult situations in the world to develop the unity and pattern and gracious loveliness that we all so deeply covet for mankind.

I know families where a real liturgy and ritual have been built up out of family devotion to such a service. It has its great dangers. It becomes very easily this particular thing which these particular limited finite human beings are doing. God is easily forgotten. But sooner or later in every such undertaking the shoe will begin to pinch, and the heart to grow weary. Then a great door swings wide, and the wise father can show his little child the picture of One who climbed a lonely hill, was deserted by His friends, cursed by those who were in deepest truth His beneficiaries, and who yet prayed for those who spitefully used Him. It will be a dull and stupid child indeed who will not carry from such an experience an impression that will deepen and sanctify life's hardest hours and prepare him in turn to take up his cross and follow Jesus. He will have learned to spell God with the right blocks.

Psychotherapy and Christianity

ROLLO R. MAY

PSYCHOTHERAPY is in our world to stay. Freud's psychoanalysis has already had a profound effect upon the spiritual attitudes of the Western world, and there is no question that future Christianity will have to reckon not only with psychoanalysis but with the special work of Jung and Alfred Adler and Otto Rank as well. Psychotherapy can be Christianity's most powerful enemy or its most efficacious instrument. "Depth-psychology," as it is often called, presents Christianity with a technique for understanding and saving souls more objective and practicable than has ever before been available.

Yet psychotherapy can at the same time be a rival religion to Christianity. Thousands of people have grasped at its teachings as for a religion, for it has offered them concepts of the meaning of life which make sense in their modern minds and likewise prove efficacious in changing their lives. In view of these considerations, let us here endeavor to determine the contributions of Christianity and psychotherapy to each other, the areas of conflict between them, and the possible resolution of these conflicts for the promotion of understanding and happiness among mankind.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF PSYCHOTHERAPY

Freud was not the first psychotherapist. Many centuries ago Socrates helped lay the foundations for modern depth-psychology when he analyzed so astutely the mechanisms of rationalization to which his fellow Athenians were prey. His classic conclusions concerning the psychological connection between knowledge and virtue are basic in modern Adlerian thought. Augustine was another landmark in the history of man's understanding of himself. His idea that in the depths of the human soul objectivity and subjectivity become merged, and that here we obtain certainty of ourselves and also of God, are profound insights that echo through the pages of modern writings like those of Jung.

Paracelsus and Jacob Boehme, philosophers of the Renaissance, contributed importantly to the exploration of the "inner world." Paracelsus was

a physician who insisted on defining health in terms of the *whole* individual, and he sought a unity of the life forces in the individual. Boehme, the fascinating mystic philosopher of the Reformation, arrived at a principle of "darkness" which contains undifferentiated force like Nietzsche's will to power and Freud's libido. But Boehme went on to point out a principle of "light" which gives form to the upsurging power of darkness, and he saw creativity in life as a struggle between these two principles.

Descartes, in the seventeenth century, set the problem which modern psychotherapy aims to solve in his unfortunate separation of mind from body; this intellectual position indubitably represents a setback in mankind's pilgrimage toward mental health. The lovable Spinoza recovered some of the lost ground in his heroic endeavor to set up a scheme of psychological control by extreme rationalistic means. There is penetrating psychological insight in his ideas that "the quality of our happiness depends on the things we love" and "I saw that all things I feared had nothing good or bad in them save as the mind was affected by them."

The powerful stream of romanticism, springing up in the eighteenth and coursing through the nineteenth century, is of the utmost importance for modern psychotherapy. Jean Jacques Rousseau, prince of romanticists, embodied in his own living, thinking and preaching the "back to nature" cravings and the rebellion against artificial restraints of his society which, to some extent like our age, had become surfeited with superficial rationalism. His dissertation presented to the Academy of Dijon, arguing that too much "arts and sciences have corrupted our souls," has a curious similarity in general, though not in detail, with Freud's distrust of society as expressed in *Civilization and Its Discontents*.

Rousseau emphasized feeling and instinct as against reason, individualism as against society, and spontaneity, simplicity, freedom and uncalculated goodness against the artificial relations in civilization. Thus he presupposes a confidence that life is fundamentally good and that human nature could be good were it not for the perverse effects of artificial culture. One should, says Rousseau, "strive to live one's self out fully with all his possibilities,"¹ and education should be a "direct and unconscious unfolding of the individual."² Modern theories of progressive education and particularly the educational theories of Alfred Adler, show much dependence upon Rousseau's *Émile*.

¹ Hoffding, *Rousseau and His Philosophy*, p. 106.

² *Ibid.*, p. 141.

Even social living can spring directly up out of the natural souls of men, said Rousseau, and the "social contract," by which men choose to unite themselves, was to him by no means a fantastic scheme. Rousseau sees God as the principle of vitality and good in nature, and religion is for him an instinctive expression of gratitude and joy and the exhilaration that comes from full living.

The most important figure between Rousseau and Freud is Frederick Nietzsche. Here was a psychoanalyst if ever one lived! He pointed out with amazing perspicacity a number of truths which were later to become basic in Freudianism. His own acute introspection disclosed to him the realm of the "unconscious"; for, says Nietzsche, the truths at which a philosopher arrives are merely a picture of his own deep self. "Instinct is the most intelligent of all kinds of intelligence"—and here Nietzsche scoops one of Jung's basic concepts. This German genius sensed something of the meaning of dreams. He realized that inner conflict, though resulting ordinarily in weakness, could be "sublimated" into art or a form of striving for power.

Life, to Nietzsche, is primarily "will to power"; "life itself is essentially appropriation, injury, conquest of the strange and weak." There is a demonic force here which brings life in conflict with life and inevitably results in destruction and death. Freud has expressed this in his idea of the "will to death," but Freud ends with a metaphysical pessimism, whereas Nietzsche sees in this ultimate destruction the very seeds of man's dignity. This gives him a *tragic* view of life rather than a pessimistic one. Nietzsche's "super-man" confronts the world egoistically and without inhibition from weak "herd morality," and he seeks to triumph over the world in a way similar to Freud's libidinous man.

We may briefly summarize here the characteristics of romanticism, which both Rousseau and Nietzsche represent, as they carry over into modern psychotherapy. (1) *Vitalism*—emphasis on some "life force" such as will to power or libido. (2) *Dynamic categories*—such as "instinct" and "ego-striving" rather than the static terms of rationalism, part and parcel of a general reaction against rationalism. (3) *Individualism*. (4) *Naturalism*—a tendency toward subjectivity, confidence in the worth of nature in the case of Nietzsche, and in the goodness of nature in the case of Rousseau.

There is some influence of rationalism in modern psychotherapy, to be sure, particularly in Adler's re-emphasis of the Socratic confidence in the ability of understanding to achieve goodness. Freud has a great confidence

in human reason used scientifically. "There is no appeal beyond reason," he says,³ and "our best hope for the future is that the intellect—the scientific spirit, reason—should establish a dictatorship over the human spirit."⁴ In general we could characterize modern psychotherapy as being romantic in its metaphysical presuppositions, rationalistic in many of its practices, and scientific in its theoretical technique.

Sigmund Freud, the father of modern psychotherapy, was born into an age which was crying for psychoanalysis. The nineteenth century was, as Nietzsche fairly says, a "sick age." Science was mechanizing man's material life and at the same time destroying the unity of his theoretical life. Art had become sentimental, artificial and peripheral. This age, carrying on for all practical purposes up to the war, is accurately characterized by Dr. Paul Tillich as "compartmentalized" (*The Religious Situation*). The tendency was to regard religion as an affair of Sunday and of special groups and to separate it from industrial and political life. In this "Victorian" period morals also suffered from compartmentalization: sex was tabooed, the vital tendencies in general received unhealthy repression, and the ethical life was increasingly made a matter of "will power," of signing pledges and conscious volition. Psychology has irrefutably proven that this repression makes for disunity in the personality because it separates the individual's vital urges from his conscious living.

ASPECTS OF MODERN PSYCHOTHERAPY

And so Sigmund Freud was called to the task of bringing unity to the compartmentalized personalities of the prewar period. This astute thinker of Vienna will indubitably go down in history as a great pioneer, probably in the class of Copernicus and Darwin. Freud began in the endeavor to apply scientific categories to personality: he therefore views the mind from a causological perspective, blocked *instinctual drive* equaling *repression* equaling *psychological complex* equaling *neurosis*. The cure theoretically consists of reversing the process: observe the neurosis, find the psychological complex, abreact and relieve the repression, and finally assist the individual to a more satisfactory expression of his instinctual drives. The ideal in personality is, then, to achieve as direct as possible expression of libidinous drives into reality with a minimum of interference from superego (the "moral judge" or con-

³ Freud, *Future of an Illusion*.

⁴ Freud, *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, p. 234.

science) and external prohibitions. The Freudian system is basically hedonistic, pleasure being viewed as the regulative principle. But since pleasure is obtainable to only a very limited extent, Freud is reduced to a deep pessimism regarding life. He denies the truth and validity of religion, terming it an obsessional neurosis having its source in the child's dependence on the father.

There are, of course, many more creative aspects of Freudianism in psychoanalytic practice than this bare outline indicates. But in his theorizing Freud has clung stubbornly to his mechanical, quasi-scientific presuppositions, and hence it remained for his disciples to work out many of the creative implications of psychoanalysis.

Alfred Adler was the first to deflect from the master, and it is significant—and a proof of the partial validity of each position—that Adler should take his stand on diametrically opposite tenets. Whereas Freud is anarchically anti-social, Adler bases his Individual Psychology on frankly social norms. Whereas Freud is extravertive, Adler is introvertive. Instead of treating the past experiences of the patient's life as causal and determinative, Adler emphasizes "teleology," the goal or direction of the style of life of the individual. Adler is confident that people make mistakes because they do not really understand; they act under illusions of inferiority, fear, persecution; when they are relieved of their rationalizations (deceits) and able truly to understand themselves and their world, they will see that their good is obtained only by contributing to the social good. The individual's "will to prestige" is the driving force, sexual libido being only a manifestation of this. To Adler the chief sins of man are vanity and ambition, both arising out of egocentricity and resulting in man's striving to dominate. The Adlerian virtues are social interest, courage, and co-operation, those qualities which are based upon a transcending of the self and which result in the individual's fulfilling his responsibility in the web of social interdependence.

C. G. Jung's basic concept is *individuation*. He sees the neurotic problems of man as caused by inability to "individuate," that is, discover and integrate one's own unique self ("life-form"). Jung defines libido as general instinctual force. By temperament more mystical than Freud or Adler, he has delved with great penetration into the strata of the unconscious, and through mythologies and folklore and dreams he has traced down the "archetypes" (similar to Plato's "Ideas") in the collective unconscious of man. Great art and religion are an expression of these archetypes. He sees great importance and validity in religious dogmas, and specifically states that men-

tal problems are in the long last religious problems, for they arise from the patient's need for love and hope and meaning.

Otto Rank, an outstanding Freudian who only recently deviated from the psychoanalytic school, has established a "will therapy" which focuses upon the personal, creative autonomy of the individual. He defines Freudian complexes in terms of will struggles, and very significantly places much emphasis upon freedom, autonomy, moral responsibility in personality. This reaction, interestingly enough, proves these considerations to have been suppressed in Freudianism.

SUMMARY OF THE PSYCHOTHERAPEUTIC VIEW OF PERSONALITY

A definition of personality which includes the principal tenets of the various schools of psychotherapy could be stated as follows: Personality is that expression of the life process which, impelled by a "*vital impulse*," is characterized by *individuality*, *autonomy* and *social interdependence*. The specific changes this tends to make in the nineteenth-century view of personality, may be listed as follows:

1. *Enlargement of the sphere of the self*. In refutation of the concept prevalent in the nineteenth century, which limited the self to consciousness, psychotherapy indicates, through its exploration of the tremendously potent and extensive "unconsciousness," that the self is infinitely broader and more portentous than previously thought.

2. *The necessity of unity* in personality. Freud and his followers have shown that no matter how "ethical" an individual appears on the surface, he cannot be truly good or healthy until he is a unified self. In other words, the conscious self must come to terms with the unconscious depths of the personality. Thus a new importance is given to simple honesty. Motives are exposed and cleansed. Rationalization is attacked as unhealthy, and hypocrisy, which is to be defined as a disharmony between motives and actions, then theoretically becomes impossible.⁵

3. *New meaning of freedom*. Freud's work in uncovering the causal-logical relationships in personality, such as between instinctual urges and behavior, had the great merit of destroying the too simple, circumscribed and static view of "free will" prevalent in nineteenth-century voluntarism.

⁵ The main reason for the hostility in many circles toward depth-psychology is this rigid insistence upon honesty and the merciless exposure, by means of effective techniques, of dishonesty. This is a parallel to the hatred felt by the Athenians toward Socrates for his relentless exposure of their rationalizations.

Though Freud goes on to deny his theoretical belief in freedom, it is significant to note that his practical therapy operates continuously on the presupposition that the individual has creative possibilities, which means freedom. What Freud does, therefore, is to remove the point of freedom to a more profound, creative and dynamic level in personality. Psychotherapy does uncover the deterministic influences in personality, such as family background, traumatic experiences, repressions, instinctual drives and all the factors of environment, and it thus proves that any simple theory of immediate "free will" is foolishness. But in the end psychotherapy insists upon the creative possibilities at a deeper point of integration of the individual personality.

These exceedingly important explorations in personality are a most valuable contribution to the Christian understanding of man. In the first place, we are assisted greatly in our dealing with the factor of temptation in daily life. We now see that temptation is not to be met by a direct, frontal attack, but rather by indirection through healthy and wholesome living in the totality of the personality. In the second place, the findings of psychotherapy indicate to preachers that mere exhortation from the pulpit is a very inefficient instrument, for it results in the prolonging of futile, conscious struggling which does not touch the center of the individual's problem and may result in psychological tensions which make the problem even worse. In the third place, this new understanding of people has given us new mercy. We send the psychiatrist to the criminal court and we call the psychologist to the juvenile delinquent, for we see that childhood experiences, glandular and environmental influences and a host of other factors are involved in any criminal case.

INADEQUACY OF PSYCHOTHERAPY

But the psychotherapeutic view of man is, by itself, incomplete. It has breadth and depth, but it lacks height. This inadequacy can best be described as *oversimplification* and *naturalism*. Adler illustrates this oversimplification in his emphasis upon natural growth of the personality toward its ideal state, which reminds us of Rousseau. The broad reliance upon the "vital impulse," the tendency to disparage norms, and the presupposing of the possibility of a too simple unity of personality are other aspects of the psychotherapeutic oversimplification.

As a result of this oversimplification, psychotherapy actually contains a

number of tensions which cannot be resolved within the limits of psychotherapy itself. For example, Adler's system ends in a tension between *will to prestige* and *social responsibility*, and although he implies that the solution lies in social interest, he is unable to explain how the ego is able by itself to renounce its striving in favor of a social point of view. For another example, Jung ends with a tension between *individuation* and the *collective unconscious*, and to imply that there is not a basic contradiction between these two is to overlook the profundity of the problem. Rank at least realizes and admits the unresolved tension between *freedom* and *guilt feeling*; creativity places this problem on a "normal" level, but Rank knows that a fundamental dualism still exists. And finally, Freud's ultimate pessimism involves his system in contradiction and indicates that some frame of reference outside itself is needed for any complete view of personality. Freud delves most profoundly when he points out that the individual is fundamentally at odds with society, and as a matter of fact is fundamentally at odds with himself and will in the end destroy himself.

Looking specifically at the field of morals, we see that the psychotherapeutic view of man is inadequate because it lacks sufficient *form* to channel the *content* of personality. It is Dionysian in its idolization of instinctual drives and self-expression, but it underestimates the importance of the Apollonian concern with form, structure, reason. The Dionysianism by itself becomes ultra-individualistic and socially anarchic and wastes itself like a river without banks.

THE NEED OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY

As we have stated above that Christianity must avail itself of the techniques offered by psychotherapy, we now state that psychotherapy must avail itself of a theology if it is to endure in any complete form. For the ultimate problems of depth-psychology are actually theological problems, and can be resolved only on the level of theology.

Christian theology preserves the tension which psychotherapy lacks in its concept of the *Divine Imperative*. This is the "height" which psychotherapy needs. Broadly speaking, the imperative is the requirement which the meaningful structure of life makes upon the individual. It is the ultimate *form* which channels the instinctual drives. This imperative comes to man particularly in the love commandment, which is an expression of the unconditioned breaking in upon the conditioned life of man. In psychotherapy we

have a concept of naturalistic love, springing up out of the instinctual urges, but in the end it turns out to be not love at all but egotism. The Christian love commandment, on the other hand, comes from God, as *against* man's existential nature. The fundamental contradiction in man's nature which even psychotherapy cannot escape can be met only by a commandment, a moral form, which comes from outside the area of contradiction. It is the essential nature of man responding to God and hence overcoming the existential nature of man. Psychotherapy, like all naturalistic moral systems, fails because it lacks this concept of essentiality. It is no accident that early Christian theology called Christ, who represents the love commandment breaking into human existence, the "Logos," a word which in Greek philosophy means the meaningful structure of the universe. Here, then, in the Logos—or Christ, or the unconditioned love commandment, or whatever one wishes to call it—is the form which psychotherapy needs to channel its powerful instinctual *content*.

That there is a continual tendency for psychotherapy itself to become a religion is certain. The various schools have their "world views" and likewise their cultic emphases. And it is clear that the adherents of the various schools—those who have been analyzed by a Freudian or a Jungian or an Adlerian therapist—employ the particular world view in most cases as a religion. Theoretically psychotherapy is concerned with removing the patient's inhibitions and setting him "free"; but there is no doubt that a content of a religious nature does carry across into the life of the patient either as an assimilation from the therapist himself or from the naturalistic presuppositions underlying the system itself. But in each case we could point out that the religious content of the psychotherapeutic schools is inadequate.

Freud's naturalism is inadequate because it becomes mired in an unrelieved pessimism. It is impossible to set up a consistent system of values on the existential level; Freud tried to, but as he saw more clearly the profound contradictions in man's existential nature, these values became undermined. Happiness is the final goal—but a happiness that is by definition unattainable. Freud laid his bet upon the natural man and natural reason and therefore leveled his original attacks at the prohibitions which curbed this natural man; but he discovered his man to be barbaric, lustful, antisocial, unamenable to reason to any efficacious extent, and driven by instincts of destruction. Traditional Christianity is no more severe with "fallen man" than Freudianism. But Christianity has a concept of essentiality, God's unconditioned character

lending meaning to a conditioned world. Freud lacks this. He refuses to examine the presuppositions inherent in his depraved man: for example, from where did man "fall," and if he is now depraved, does that not imply that there are values by which one can judge depravity? Freudianism ends in a bog of inconsistency in regard to its therapy and a mire of pessimism in regard to its theory. Freud proves to us the impossibility of establishing any metaphysical or religious system without reference to essentiality.

Jung's immanent mysticism presents us with a most interesting psychotherapeutic defense of religion, but one which we discover on more than superficial analysis to be based upon a mystic immanence which does not adequately take into consideration the need for the transcendent, unconditioned aspect of God. Jung frankly states that his patients must arrive at some idea of God to become mentally healthy. This idea or archetype of God is found in the deepest stratum of the collective unconscious. At this point the individual ego is merged with a collective ego much larger than itself.

The danger of this is clear: it tends to identify God with the unconscious self, if not of the individual at least of the human race. Describing persons who "found" God and therefore mental health, Jung says, "They came to themselves, they could accept themselves. . . . This is much like what was formerly expressed by saying: He has made his peace with God."⁶ This runs the risk of exhausting God in one's self, or the collective self, which, qualitatively speaking, amounts to the same thing. God speaks through the collective unconscious, to be sure, but He is much more than the unconscious of one man or the collective unconscious of all men.

Adler's rationalistic humanism is inadequate because humanity cannot lift itself by its own bootstraps merely with the aid of natural reason. He makes the problem too easy: there is a too simple confidence that man is like a flower "which grows spontaneously toward the sun when the stones that obstruct it are removed" (quoted from a lecture by an assistant to Doctor Adler). This view does not penetrate to the profounder and more tragic aspects of human nature, wherein lies the contradiction of which Christian theology, and in a different sense, Freud, speak.

There is a suggestion of a "logos theory" in Adler. He postulates a certain basic structure of the universe (to him the social universe), and it is with this that the individual must bring himself into accord. It remained for the Adlerian Fritz Kunkel to work out the deeper implications of this idea.

⁶ Jung, *Psychology and Religion*, p. 49.

Kunkel sees the will to prestige as a fundamental egocentricity in man's nature which causes him to set himself up against society and the "universe." This basic egocentricity is Kunkel's description, I think it is fair to say, of that characteristic in man which Christian theologians have described for many centuries—man's self-will which causes him to set himself out of his rightful place and to affront God. Kunkel's view of this deep tendency has similarities to the Christian concept of original sin and the Greek doctrine of "hybris."

Kunkel realizes the difficulties in the individual's renouncing his egocentricity in favor of response to the demands of the structure of the universe; he specifically points out that the man's *willing* to do so is unavailing, for that willing will in turn be egocentric. But renunciation does occur by a process of "clarification": when the individual has suffered sufficiently to renounce his self-centered will, and when he has received "insight," he is able to "respond" to the demands of the structure of the universe. This response includes an element of grace. Kunkel is clear that the individual is dependent upon superpersonal factors in his ability to respond. It is parallel to what would be called in religion "natural grace," coming from God but not specifically through the death of Christ. But the tension between egocentricity and response to life remains; clarification is a turning-point like religious conversion, but sin (in the form of a tendency toward egocentric willing) still resides in the individual, and grace must be received continually. This system of Kunkel's is the most adequate treatment by a psychotherapist of the relation between psychotherapy and the concepts of Christian theology.

The problems with which psychotherapy ends are answered in Christian theology in terms of man's relationship to God. Thus only a doctrinal system which takes into consideration both the God-aspect of man's nature and the conditioned is adequate. Such concepts as "Christ" and "logos" are necessary as norms for the existential living of man. Any adequate psychotherapy must presuppose such norms. Only thus can the necessary dialectical tension, which is implied in man's nature, be preserved; and only thus can the romantic, one-level view of man with its treacherous mires of superficiality and confusion be avoided.

Once to admit the contradiction in man's nature is to admit likewise that a concept of grace is necessary. The contradiction requires some bridging link which will give the possibility to existential man of attaining something of essentiality. Grace furnishes this. To the extent that various psychotherapists have pierced beyond the presuppositions of their systems and have sensed

some of the import of essentiality, they have admitted certain suggestions of the grace concept. Jung specifically states that grace works in the restoring of mental health, but his grace is of a diffused, natural kind that is akin to physical healing. Kunkel comes closer to a satisfactory handling of this matter. But the adequate concept of grace is, according to this analysis, that of Christian theology, in which God as the unconditioned essentiality impinges at every moment upon the conditioned world, looks upon the human beings therein with forgiveness, and thus enables them to participate in essentiality.

RELIGION NECESSARY FOR MENTAL HEALTH

There are profound practical implications which follow from this discussion. Religion is necessary for true mental health. For the deepest aspects of psychotherapy, we have shown, are dependent upon religion; therefore it can justifiably be held that the "sick" individual with whom psychotherapy deals can be cured in the end only when his religious adjustment is adequately made. The fundamental problems of men are, then, religious problems and demand religious answers. Psychotherapy is valuable as a technique, but its lasting value is dependent upon its acceptance of adequate religious content. When psychotherapy succeeds in unifying a personality, when, in other words, a "clarification" is achieved, the individual is able to feel trust and hope and to feel that his life has meaning. To achieve this the individual must come into a right relationship with God, who is the unconditioned meaning of his life. Trust and hope on any other basis will be only temporary. Thus, ultimately speaking, the meaning of psychotherapy becomes dependent upon religion.

What Is the Gospel?

CHARLES E. SCHOFIELD

THE time has now come; the reign of God is near; repent and believe in the gospel."

With these words the second evangelist sums up the tenor of the message with which Jesus began His public preaching. What is it that constitutes "the gospel" which it is the business of the Church to preach?

I

We face a sharply defined difference of opinion within the Christian fellowship. During the past fifty years a significant body of sentiment has been growing, particularly within the Church in the United States of America, which insists that the gospel must be interpreted in terms of social action and political and economic reconstruction. This movement roots back in the influence of the "Christian Socialists" in England, in the middle of the last century, and in the careers of such men in America as Walter Rauschenbusch, Washington Gladden, Francis G. Peabody, Henry Churchill King, Harry F. Ward, and Bishop Francis J. McConnell. Beginning with the adoption of "The Social Creed," by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in 1908, followed shortly after by its acceptance by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, practically all of the major Protestant denominations have officially approved pronouncements dealing with the attitude of the Church toward critical social, economic and political issues. These declarations have expressed opinions upon such questions as wage scales, hours of labor, the conditions under which men and women are employed, child labor, the right of workers to organize and bargain collectively with their employers, war and military training, the plight of agriculture, attitudes toward and relations between different races, old-age pensions, unemployment insurance and similar acute social and economic questions. Some of these declarations, particularly during the past ten or a dozen years, have called the whole capitalistic system of economy in question, and have sought for Christian support and active participation in an effort to bring about a radical reconstruction of the basic pattern of society. One of

the contributors to the symposium, *The Younger Churchmen Look at the Church*, published a few years ago, insists that "to assist in the creation of a government that will make this revolutionary transformation of our economic order should be the main task of the Church today."

More recently conservatives within the Church, led largely by laymen, have begun to voice a vigorous protest against this tendency to resolve the gospel into a revolutionary program of social action, and to posit the center of the problem of religion in the external relationships of men rather than in the inner life. Professional patrioteers, with a weather eye ever on the alert to detect suspicious signs of pacifism, or that even more dread bogey of contemporary society, Communism, have drawn up blacklists of both clerical and lay leaders in the Church who are regarded as dangerous and subversive influences. Other laymen, who have been reared in unquestioning acceptance of the established economic institutions of society, have been honestly disturbed by the questions that economic protestants have been lifting. They have become concerned to rescue the Church from the danger of losing her bearings and set her back upon the true course of a "pure" gospel ministry. A group of Methodist laymen met at the Union League Club, Chicago, in July, 1935, in order to launch a movement at the General Conference at Columbus to swing the Methodist Episcopal Church back toward what they believed the proper course for Christians to take. A few sentences from the statement which this group adopted and sent out to the churches will serve excellently to define this point of view:

The fundamental object of the Methodist Episcopal Church is the building of Christian character. The message of the Church is personal, individual. True Christianity relies, for its influence on social and economic conditions, upon the work of individuals who have accepted the philosophy of Christianity and have ordered their lives by it. . . . Between the philosophy of Christianity, with its emphasis upon the personal relationship and responsibility of man to men and of men to God, and the philosophy of economic determinism which relates all human happiness to economic reward, we feel that there is essential and inevitable conflict. Therefore, it is the sense of this group that when the pulpit and the religious press substitute economic and social systems for the Christian ideal of choice, they are losing sight of their fundamental objectives.

II

We accept without argument the general proposition that the gospel is concerned with the building of Christian character. We ought, further, humbly to confess that the questions that have been raised by European Chris-

tians concerning the legitimacy and value of the feverish activism of American Christianity, *do* have a point. We in America have been obsessed with the idea that we could solve all of our problems by some kind of reconstruction of the physical and social environment, or by remaking the mechanical processes of human association. The final stage in the great revival movement which found its most dramatic expression in the gigantic tabernacle campaigns of the Reverend William A. Sunday in the years just preceding the World War, was an expression of this naïve confidence in mechanisms. We went out to storm the metropolis of America. It has been remarked, as a tribute to "Billy" Sunday's success as an evangelist, that he was able to keep religion on the front pages of the New York newspapers during the very days in which our nation was entering the war with the Central Powers. It might temper somewhat the degree of our appreciation of this achievement if we should read again the things which the preacher said, as reported in the headlines. It is not so difficult to keep religion on the front page when the exponents of religion virtually "sell out" to the popular mass enthusiasms of the time.

The tabernacle type of mass evangelism rested its confidence of success essentially upon the mechanics of mass psychology. It deliberately "set the stage." It studiously "worked up" the enthusiasm of the crowd and then regimented the persons who were caught up in the religious hysteria of the hour toward a triumphal march down the "sawdust trail." We do not gainsay that this type of evangelism produced results that were conserved and built into permanent reconstructions of individual lives. For a time at least it seemed to transform whole communities. But it represented, nonetheless, the popular mood of confidence in mechanisms.

The campaign for national prohibition offers another illustration. We set out to reform the habits of the nation by constitutional amendment. Once the amendment was adopted we marched out, armed with the big stick of "the law," chanting the refrain, "It's in the Constitution and it's there—there to stay," determined to compel the recalcitrant to conform to the new pattern of behavior. The prohibition experiment failed largely because of two facts. On the one hand, we ignored the fact, to which the whole history of legislative reform bears witness, that the customs of a people can never be changed by legislation. Before a law can be made effective there must have been built up a substantial body of sentiment in its favor and a substantial body of practice, generally observed. Legislation, if it is to be successful, simply recognizes a *fait accompli*. It defines a practice already accepted and approved,

and organizes the collective force of the community to make universal a pattern of behavior generally practiced by the community. In the second place, prohibition failed because of the degree to which the dry forces depended upon the mere mechanics of legislative and judicial procedure. After all, our primary business in the Church is neither the struggle to secure remedial legislation, nor the effort to enforce laws already enacted. Our primary business is to create in individual citizens those basic attitudes which produce the will to intelligent co-operative social living.

To this extent the protest of the conservative laymen is well taken. To a considerable degree their insistence that religion must appeal to the individual and must seek as its primary object an awakened and redeemed individual, is pointing in the right direction. We shall never effect any lasting reconstruction of society until we succeed in producing a substantial body of genuinely reconstructed individuals. The problem of individual character *is* elemental.

The weakness and relative futility of much of the preaching directed toward specific social issues are partly due to the fact that it has so largely dealt in abstractions and generalities. We have denounced war and capitalism and the profit motive with a right good will, and the people, approving, have gone home without any inkling that it meant anything definite or concrete in the reconstruction of their own personal habits and behavior. Our whole discussion of political and economic questions has been carried on too largely from a detached and impersonal point of view. We have failed to think through the concrete and specific implications of what we have been saying about society in the large for the everyday conduct of individual men and women. We have failed to see clearly the way in which the major social sins of our time—war, and nationalism, race and class antagonisms, and economic injustice—root down in individual personal attitudes that find expression in concrete behavior patterns in everyday living. In our preaching and teaching, the issues raised by the social application of the gospel have not been defined sharply enough to produce a keen cutting edge with which to attack the problems of personal living. We have been content to be social radicals in general with no very definite objectives in particular. Like the late Calvin Coolidge's pastor, we have been emphatically "against sin," but we have had no very clear notions about how to stop our sinning.

The whole history of the social gospel movement within the Church reveals a strangely simple and naïve faith in the might and worth of resolutions. It has not seemed to matter by what devious parliamentary stratagems the

resolutions might finally be wangled through to adoption. We have been singularly indifferent to the size of the silent vote in many of our church gatherings. There have been many not in sympathy with the sentiments embodied in the resolutions, who, however, were unwilling to accept the onus of active opposition and let the resolutions pass by default. The conservative minds of the group have cherished a degree of cynical contempt for the futility of resolution-passing that we need to set over against the faith of the social radicals in the effectiveness of the process. We have too often reckoned it a mark of steady progress toward the millennium if we have been able to press through to adoption, by a succession of conferences or conventions, resolutions or declarations that took more and more extreme positions in the direction of the complete acceptance of the Marxian criticism of a capitalistic economy, and approval of the Marxian program of social reconstruction. In the phrasing of our resolutions we have persistently kept a weather eye open for the insatiable appetite of headline writers for sensational copy. Having successfully pushed the resolution through to adoption we have been off posthaste to the nearest reporter, hoping to make a front-page "spread" in the next issue of the newspaper.

Two motives have apparently impelled us to pursue so zealously the program of "resolutionary" radicalism. Some of us have been gravely concerned over the degree to which the proletarian masses have been alienated from the Church. And we have sought the passage of resolutions to be offered as evidence that the discontented masses can count upon the Church as an ally rather than as an enemy. Then, too, we have been concerned to attempt to muster the immense resources represented by the Christian community back of some program of social reconstruction. We have felt that, if we could only get the Church officially committed to the promotion and support of social revolution, we would give a tremendous forward push to the whole enterprise. The only kind of resolutions that carry any real weight are resolutions that define the actual practice of the group that adopts them. The alienated masses of labor, and particularly their leaders, are not likely to be impressed with words. They have heard brave words spoken too often to be deceived by sonorous periods and resounding resolutions. And, certainly, the mere adoption of resolutions that do not represent a serious intent to action can offer no substantial assistance for any kind of revolutionary social reconstruction. Unless the resolutions represent a program which a substantial portion of the Christian community will really try to put into effect in concrete action, no

matter what it may cost, we may have been guilty, in the publicizing of our resolutions, of virtually attempting to obtain money under false pretense.

The mere adoption of a resolution is not particularly significant. Society will never be reconstructed by resolution. And, after all, the primary value of the resolutions that we do adopt is not to be sought in their influence upon groups outside the church, either revolutionary or reactionary. The primary value of resolutions adopted by a group must always be as an instrument for the education of the constituency of the group, and as a means of crystallizing for more effective action convictions that have already taken form in the thinking of the rank and file of those represented. It is only as a substantial body of men and women who are actively engaged in economic and political enterprise come to a reconstruction of their own basic attitudes, arrive at new convictions relative to the critical issues of contemporary society, and resolve upon decisive action in support of these new convictions, that any radical revision of economic and political practices can be achieved. Religion still must function primarily in relation to the basic attitudes of individuals.

III

On the other hand, it is quite apparent that most of those who vigorously oppose the "social gospel" today do so out of a rather impressive ignorance of what religion has meant all through the history of the Hebrew-Christian movement. To begin with, the issues in the facing of which men and women have come to the experience that we call "conversion," have always carried definite implications for conduct. There are rare occasions when conversion has turned upon a purely intellectual issue. The degree to which major decisions find their focus in a purely intellectual problem is severely limited. Only a relatively small proportion of the population in any average community are ever so keenly sensitized to intellectual problems or sufficiently well equipped in the discipline of critical thinking, as to find the decisive issues for their living in this area. In most instances in which intellectual formulas have been made the symbols of decision—as in the famous Arian controversy in the fourth century—the significant issues were in the areas of social and political relationships.

Throughout the revival period, decision for Christ consistently carried with it a declaration upon practical issues of behavior that affected the social and often the economic and political relationships of the individuals con-

cerned. We need only remind ourselves of the attitude taken by the Church upon such questions as human slavery; the habit of using intoxicating liquors and participation in the liquor traffic; the campaign which John Wesley persistently carried on in the early Methodist societies against smuggling; and the issue of polygamy that became the crux of the conflict between the Mormon people and orthodox Christians. Even when the evangelistic challenge was severely limited to the attitudes of the individual, the primary tests of conversion usually included a willingness to give up dancing, card playing and attendance at the theater. This test applied in any extensive degree, inevitably involved a major reconstruction of the social practices of any average community. Even in the period in which the emphasis of gospel preaching was most emphatically placed upon the individual aspects of religious experience, the gospel was not without far-reaching social implications. It is clear, from a reading of the literature of the apostolic age, that those who accepted Christ and identified themselves with the Christian Church were required to make a clean break with the institutions and practices of pagan society. One of the primary motives that led Governor Pliny, in the second century, to appeal to the Emperor Trajan for an official ruling, was the degree to which the growth of the Christian community had disrupted the ordinary economic and social institutions of his province. "The world," which in the Johannine literature stands in such sharply defined and irreconcilable contrast with the Christian way of life, meant just that—the world—the whole pattern and practice of pagan society. To the Christian in the apostolic age, the ultimate outcome was beyond question. Whether by eschatological intervention or by processes of social reconstruction within the framework of mundane society, "the kingdom of the world" must "become the kingdom of our Lord, and of his Christ."

When we turn to face the problem of character building realistically, we recognize at once that no one can be indifferent to the nature of the economic and social environment that so largely conditions character development. Nor can we leave out of our reckoning the question of the kind of behavior in which a genuinely Christian character must find expression in the life of the community. The Christian must manage to live, not only in the more congenial atmosphere of the Christian fellowship, but also in the far more rigorous climate of the unchristian community. Economic practices that are an expression of greed, of narrow selfish aims, of ruthless disregard of the consequences to the lives of others—these cannot fail to fall under the

condemnation of a sensitive Christian conscience. The environment under which multitudes of boys and girls are compelled to live—crowded, unsanitary living quarters, inadequate facilities for normal play life, undernourishment and lack of medical or hospital treatment, limited educational opportunities, vicious and immoral surroundings, labor that stunts growth, bars the way to education, and exploits childhood for greed; a social situation that denies to young lives standing upon the threshold of manhood opportunity, either to earn a decent livelihood, or to establish wholesome family relationships—such situations must inevitably be of direct concern to anyone who takes seriously the problem of character building. If the gospel deals primarily with the making of character, it will have to come directly to grips with an unsocial environment that blights life before it can attain to a maturity of vigorous and wholesome development.

In a similar way, no pattern of human behavior, no human attitude toward other human beings, no idea of the ends to be sought and the values to be cherished that sharply contradicts the essential Christian ideal of life and sense of ultimate values, can ever be a matter of unconcern to anyone who takes seriously the question of building Christian character. Ideals cannot be kept alive in a vacuum. They must become incarnate in individual and social living. To deal in lies, to become a party to the adulteration of products put upon the market in order to increase the profits derived from their sale, to accept a pattern of living that exalts greed as the primary human motive and accords the accolade of success to those who betray every value that the gospel insists must be conserved—what is that but unchristian? To banter prejudices and hates, to accept a share in producing or in disseminating propaganda that is false; to cultivate, cherish, and promote attitudes toward other races and nations that breed hate and fear and pave the way to war, to acquiesce in economic and nationalistic policies that disrupt the peaceful and friendly relationships of the world-community—how can we reconcile that kind of practice with the spirit of the Nazarene? To use the tremendous power of concentrated capital, with the immense advantages of economic security which such wealth carries with it; to coerce men and women, driven by the fear of starvation and paralyzed by their sense of helplessness, to stand in solitary weakness against the might of corporate wealth, so that they are willing to accept conditions of labor and a meager fraction of the wealth that their labor has produced—how can anyone call that Christian conduct? To deny to the laborer the right to bargain

collectively with employers who never bargain in any other way except collectively—how can we square that with “the Golden Rule”? To cultivate a spirit of racial superiority, to cherish delusions of caste or class, to set barriers of color or of wealth or of cultural opportunity or of standards of expenditure hedging in the manifestation of the spirit of fellowship—how could anyone accept that kind of living and still profess to remember the parable of the good Samaritan? The gospel *is* concerned, primarily, with the problem of character building. And for that very reason those who represent the gospel must speak out upon every critical issue that affects the social, economic or political life of men.

IV

How, then, shall we define the gospel? “Gospel” means “good news.” The gospel is good news to men. In a world so haunted by the seemingly impersonal character of the cosmos, so caught and shackled by an even more sinister impersonal economic environment, it is good news to know about “the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.” It is good news to discover, back of the veil of things, and in the midst of the welter and confusion of economic struggle, a heart of infinite compassion. It is good news that men who profess to believe in God must face the peremptory demand to reconstruct their attitudes toward each other upon the basis of genuine concern for their neighbors and in the interest of a vital fellowship.

The gospel is good news to men. In a world in which we find ourselves caught in the toils of the evil consequences of our own misdeeds, and taken captive by the bitter long entail of evils that flow out from the selfishness and greed and cruelty and indifference of other men, it is good news to catch a vision of “that strange man upon His cross.” To know about the God who “spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all,” gives one new courage and new hope. This universe is not a grim prison house for the human spirit in which the unimaginable cosmic processes grind on without concern for the values the human spirit cherishes. At the heart of the universe is redemptive love—a grand recreative process that is forever seeking the conservation of all the essential values that give life splendor and worth. It is good news to know that “human nature” is not the ultimate frustration of every high and holy aspiration. “Instead of being moulded to this world” we may “have our mind renewed and so be transformed in nature, able to make out what the will of God is.” This is not a matter of theory. It is a

matter of testimony and of experience. The gospel is good news to men. And "news" is the report of that which has already come to pass. "There is a new creation whenever a man comes to be in Christ; what is old is gone, the new has come."

The gospel is good news to men. Not the wheel of the unchanging East, forever returning upon itself, endlessly repeating the same dreary hopeless past—that is not the symbol of the processes of life in this world. Not the wheel, but the keys that open a door to a new way of life. "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Not the wheel, but the open road is the symbol of life in the gospel of Jesus. "I am the way, the truth, and the life." The corporate experience of men is not shut up to an endless repetition of the old futility and despair. When a truly devoted Christian man enters into any situation there enters in a new creative force. And it is in the very devotion of individual lives to the grand objective of "building Jerusalem here in this fair and present land" that those very lives themselves become transformed. As men become "transformed in nature" so society comes to be reconstructed after a new pattern. As men and women dedicate themselves to the reconstruction of society they discover in that very dedication the open way to the transformation of their own character and life.

The gospel is good news to men. "News" is something new, something that never has happened before. Of course it is true that the gospel is impractical in this kind of a world. That is the whole point of it. The gospel proposes not to be content with this kind of a world, but to create a new world. The rule of the jungle need not continue world without end to determine economic relationships. War is not inevitable. Racial lines can be transcended. The first petition in the model prayer, after the expression of adoration of God, is a declaration of faith in the social effectiveness of the gospel, and a dedication of life to an enterprise of social reconstruction. "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven." The gospel is good news that those who commit themselves to the Christian way are determined to dedicate their lives to the remaking of this world into a kingdom of righteousness and love.

The gospel is good news to men. It is the sounding of a bugle calling men and women to enlist in the grandest adventure to which the human spirit ever has responded. We have misread our human nature when we have con-

cluded that we need to make the gospel soft and easy if we are to make it appeal to men. The gospel of Mussolini and of Stalin and of Hitler is not an easy gospel. It offers men no soft and comfortable way. The human heart has a profound affinity for hardship and for devotion to a desperately difficult task—provided it is a task worthy of sacrifice. We know now, beyond any question, that the making of this world into a Christian world is no holiday excursion. There is risk. There is danger. There is stubborn and determined opposition. There are malignant powers that conspire to destroy anyone who dares to cherish faith or nourish hope or venture to aspire. There is a cross that still casts its dread grim shadow across the Christian's way. "We have to struggle, not with blood and flesh but . . . with the spiritual hosts of evil in the heavenly sphere." The way that anyone who would take the gospel of Jesus in earnest must walk, will lead him to cross the purposes of governments, to challenge the right of private interests to violate elemental human rights, to throw down the gauge of battle to such deeply rooted and strongly entrenched institutions as the military system, and the economic overlords of our contemporary capitalistic society. The Christian's way will lead him face to face with the venom of the fires of racial prejudice and the hate of economic privilege. It is an impossible undertaking to make this a Christian world. Therefore it appeals to the human heart as no other kind of enterprise ever can appeal. It is only a race of supermen, a race of men like gods, that could succeed. The gospel is good news that those who commit themselves to this impossible Christian enterprise discover that they have entered into a divine alliance. In the confidence of the grand adventurous faith of those who have committed themselves without compromise to the thralldom of Jesus, those who have become Christ's men, there is the promise of victory. "Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world."

The Complete Faith

HARRY M. TAYLOR

I

FIVE years ago, Nicholas Berdyaev startled the world with his little book, *The End of Our Time*. Since then, there has been increasing agreement among discerning critics that the historical period which superseded the Middle Ages has come to a close.

If it be true that we are living in the first days of a new era, the challenge of our future is uniquely serious. We stand—with men like Pythagoras and Plato, Paul and John, Irenaeus and Athanasius, John of Damascus and Anselm, Bacon and Descartes—charged with the responsibility of an epoch. It is for us to determine whether or not this next era shall be Christian, whether or not all forms of culture shall come to express the vital meanings and utilize the transforming power of that revelation which was and is in Jesus Christ.

In the excitement of our pioneer mood, in the daring of our reborn will to evangelize our world, we must not forget that the total past lives in every present, to a degree determining all futurity. This does not mean that the message and influence of the past are contingent upon some mechanical law of causation, even though it be dignified by the name, Providence. The meaning and influence of the past for the present and future will depend, in large measure, upon the free choices and intellectual activities of living persons.

The past is our heritage, to be accepted as a privilege and a debt; but like most inheritances, it is not free of incumbrances and liabilities. There are skeletons in the closets of our spiritual ancestry. Our forebears contribute to our glory *and* shame.

Wherefore, the critical assessment of the past is one of the first duties for us who live "between the ages." We must make the values of the past secure for our age and posterity. We must also atone for the sins of the past. Before we can do this, we must distinguish clearly between wheat and chaff.

No one of us can do this work. The labor is Herculean. And one suspects that Hercules, in this case, will be generations of devoted and competent Christians. Every serious contribution, however small, will be needed.

The present contribution will be a criticism of a destructive tendency in the theology of the period which came after the Middle Ages.

Difficulties arise when one speaks about an historical period. In the first place, an epoch is not set apart from the rest of history by rigid, precise boundaries. The unity of history transcends its distinct moments. Historical boundaries are, in a sense, but the projected distinctions of analytical, backward-looking mind.

In the second place, the fixing of dates to limit eras is a somewhat arbitrary and inadequate business. Why not include Saint Augustine with the medievals? The end of the post-medieval era was foreshadowed in the pessimism of the Romantics. The line drawn between the medieval and post-medieval eras seems to leave Roger Bacon and Abelard, wistfully, on the wrong side.

In the third place, any period is compounded of many elements. Generalizations about an epoch are always unfair to its complexity. One will find some of the tissues of all eras in any one of them. The differences are usually of proportion and configuration.

While these things are true, they are not the whole truth. Let us grant that the people of any period seize upon, utilize, and transform all of the essential experience of prior periods, thus making history appear to be a single, evolving whole. May we not yet recognize unity and distinctness to be complementary rather than antagonistic? When we admit that the roots of any present go far back into the past, that its filaments reach far into the future, does this mean that there is, therefore, no distinctive present? There have been minority traditions in every age, protests against the *Zeitgeist*. Does it follow that such nonconformity cancels out the prevailing tendency? Perhaps it is true that differences among periods have to do, chiefly, with matters of arrangement and "more or less." Yet who would hold that an explanation of the differences amounts to a denial of them?

No. As we view the past, we realize that there is something distinctive about every historical period—unless, indeed, our judgment be circumscribed by some narrow dogma of unity. When we turn from the *Summa* of Saint Thomas to Bacon's *Novum Organum*, we have passed from one ethos to another, even though it be true, as Professor Whitehead teaches, that scientific empiricism was but the application of medieval principles to the problems and data of experiment. While Greece came to new life in the Renaissance, the Renaissance was not Greece.

Having paid a cock to the niceties of qualification, we are now free to deal with a characteristic of post-medieval theology. What we say may be somewhat unfair to Calvin, or Wesley, or others; but then, we speak of a peculiarity of the period, not of some peculiarity *within* the period.

II

A generalization usually has more pedagogical than logical value. To bring an issue sharply before us, let us indulge in several gross generalizations:

The Renaissance remembered everything Greek but the law of proportion. The post-medieval age utilized everything medieval but the principle of integration. Its typical theology, to use Stephen Leacock's figure, mounted the horse of orthodoxy and rode off rapidly in every direction.

The typical post-medieval theologian did not see the Christian faith steadily and see it whole. He joined a school, or started one, and busied himself with some elements of Christian truth to the exclusion of others. In post-medieval theology, emphasis was shifted from the main stream to particular eddies.

This far from unproductive activity was tragic and impotent in degree as it is significant that the Christian faith is an organic body of truth, a specific corpus of revelation with a definite center and a definite structure. It is to be hoped that we have learned enough from critics like Hume, Kant, and Mill, to keep us from identifying that faith with some system of rational dogmas. Yet such corrective criticism should not blind us to the apparent fact that if our faith be not a definitely constituted whole, if it does not include a definite and complete body of doctrines, it is nothing definite, and therefore nothing unique.¹

To say that the Christian faith has a structure uniquely its own, to say that it is perfect, is not to imply that it is to be equated with some rigid formula. Truth involves the creativity of personal experience, a ground of personal relationships, and personality means freedom. Truth is sufficiently elastic to meet the demands of individuality and changing situations.

¹ This is the distinction here made between "doctrine" and "dogma": Christian doctrine is the body of truth concerning God and man and their relations in Jesus Christ through which men may find that life which is reflected in the New Testament. Christian dogma is the form in which a Christian doctrine is cast by some ecclesiastical authority. The precondition of Christian experience is a knowledge of certain truths. A nondoctrinal Christianity is nothing distinctive. Since Christianity is committed to evangelization, dogmas are necessary as instruments of adaptation and interpretation. A doctrine is fundamental and eternal. The function of a dogma is the establishment of a vital nexus between the unchanging eternal and the evanescent temporal; hence, it is subordinate and relative; it ceases to be valid the moment it obscures, hinders, or perverts, the doctrinal truth which it serves.

To say that truth has definite objective validity is not to deny that it is "dynamic," as Leibniz held, or "existential," to use Kierkegaard's now more popular term. There is no contradiction between the *law* of thought and the *life* of thought. Because the human eye has a precise structure, it can weep—or twinkle!

If we have managed to slip between the Scylla of God's fact and the Charybdis of man's freedom, we may heed the voices of two great teachers. Lotze—there is nothing like a truth-in-a-vacuum; truth is always something in relations; its *truth* depends upon its standing in *proper* relations. Professor Curtis—if you would know the real truth of any Christian doctrine, you must know the truth of all Christian doctrines.

These principles constitute a standard which measures, and finds wanting, the post-medieval genius for mutilating and distorting the faith. Mr. T. S. Eliot has this standard in mind when he defines heresy as the overemphasis of some phase of orthodox truth, out of proper relation with, or to the exclusion of, all other elements of that truth. Such definition has been Doctor Stanley Hopper's warrant in describing the post-medieval age as "an age of heresy."

Doctor Hopper adds that the two chief heresies of that age have been Catholicism and Protestantism. He does not mean that there is anything essentially or necessarily heretical in either. His point may be illustrated most effectively by reference to the problem of authority.

Catholic and Protestant alike agree (when pressed in argument) that the living Christ is the central and absolute authority in all spiritual concerns. We hardly need to study Schleiermacher to know that the most important thing in life is a vital experience of personal communion with the Master. What He was and is, what He said and did, what He means for those who truly seek and find Him—these things constitute the final authority for Christian thought and behavior. No one will deny that His saving and revealing Presence may be secured for us through mediatorial or instrumental means. Neither will anyone deny, I trust, that these *aids* have authoritative validity only as they serve to bring us "face to face" with the One who alone speaks with authority.

After painstaking research, Coleridge admitted that one will seek in vain for any repudiation of this "Christo-centricity" in the great Catholic writings. But he found a pronounced discrepancy between theory and practice. Since the day of Irenaeus, Catholic practice has always been in danger of elevating

some ecclesiastical strategy of mediation above personal experience with the Mediator. During the past era (perhaps because of its task of maintaining its distinctive life in the presence of Protestantism), Catholic practice has tended increasingly to render the authority of the living Christ subordinate to the formal dicta of representatives of a vast and highly integrated institution. Now the Church has a valid word of authority, but only as its "ecclesiastical word" is subordinate to, and the vital reflection of, the "living Word."

Coleridge was just as drastic in condemning the practice of Protestants. Borrowing a term from Lessing, he accused Protestants of "bibliolatry." Protestantism is no less in danger of abstract legalism than is Catholicism, even though it substitutes a book for an institution. Luther and Calvin were aware of this danger. But what of their followers? The Friends have a real point, one-sided though it be. We stand justly accused of tending to make written, holy words the sole guide in belief and behavior. So great has been our temptation to make of the New Testament canon, a New Testament idol, that leaders of the recent Reformation revival (like Professor Brunner) have had to stress the distinction between "Biblical words" and "the living Word of the Bible." Our reverence for Scripture is Christian only as we recognize that its validity is contingent upon its power to bring men into the presence of the Master.

This is the sort of thing I mean when I speak of the partializing or distorting tendency of post-medieval theology. The authority of the living Christ is basic and central and absolute. All other authorities are instrumental, subordinate, and relative. Whenever this structure is violated, there is an essential perversion of the faith, and there is a proportional frustration of its efficacy.

We have a second convenient illustration in the deism of the eighteenth century. (What a pity that the tomb of that century was not able to hold its dead!) Deism was an unrestricted faith in the power of human reason, posing as faith in Jesus Christ. The spirit of experimental empiricism had culminated in a flat repudiation of everything miraculous. The natural was proudly affirmed to be sufficient for the natural. Rationalism had led to the disclaiming of all need of supernatural revelation. The result, or at least the concomitant, in the Church was barren legalism and licentious individualism.

We should malign our faith if we condemned, in its name, any sound optimism arising from a belief in the dignity of man and the value of his powers. The Christian view of Providence involves the trust that God wills to

share His tasks, responsibilities, and life with men; hence that men have powers commensurate with the demands and privileges thus ordained. Deny the trustworthiness of critical intelligence, and you have taken the first logical step toward the denial of moral selfhood and revelation.

This is true. But it is not the whole truth. Unless one says more, even this is false. The deists forgot, or denied, that man learns only because God reveals, and that revelation implies that there is a supernatural function which is prior to, and the condition of, the human function in the learning process. They forgot, or denied, that man's power to know God's truth is purchased through the miracles of the Incarnation and the Atonement. They forgot, or ignored, that Christian epistemology which is suggested in such statements as, "I am the truth," and "the Life was the Light of men." They forgot, or ignored, the difficulties which inhere in the fact of the close relation between sin and ignorance. So they built another Babel, and christened it *enlightenment!*

Is the warning of the deist confusion of tongues a little faint? Then let us consider another illustration of the madness which has usurped the prerogatives of Christian sanity. Surely, we remember the controversy between the Modernists and the Fundamentalists.

When we speak of Modernism in this connection, we mean modern theological Liberalism. Modernist psychology was characterized by the will to be receptive of new truth, and liberal in all matters of theological interpretation and ecclesiastical administration. It resulted in a polemic against the vitiating practice of identifying Christian spirit and truth with once useful but outmoded dogmas. The function of human intelligence and effort in the program of redemption and progress was stressed. Much was made of the fact that, if the gospel of Jesus is to be effective, it must be expressed in terms that can be grasped by the people addressed; it must speak to, and meet the needs of, the persons confronted.

This Modernist dialectic was normally related to the doctrine of the humanity of Jesus and the fact that He established the kingdom of God upon earth. A new confidence in the dignity of man and his high destiny was born. The examples and precepts of the most perfect Man came to have increased significance in this setting of optimistic and liberal humanism.

Could there be anything more Christian? So far, nothing. But the Liberal creed went further. It carried its optimism to the point of a virtual denial of the doctrine of sin (let us not bandy words about the term, "orig-

inal"). It emphasized the value of the humanity of Jesus to the point of a virtual denial of the necessity for, and fact of, His deity. There being nothing so like a concave as a convex, it was so thorough in exorcising the demons of dogma, that it made mere dogmas of the virgin birth and the Resurrection. (Was there ever a more naïve instance of throwing out the baby with the bath?)

Since Professor Brunner published his monumental work, *The Mediator*, one may say these things and still pretend to be intellectually respectable. The Modernist had a way of hiding his relativist view of sin behind the classic metaphors of the Fathers and under a cloak of evangelical passion. Though he did not believe that Christ actually was God (uncreated), though he did not believe that Christ actually was different *in kind* from all other men, he used such conceptions as "divinity," and "value of God," and "difference in degree amounting to difference in kind," so shrewdly as to disguise the patent fact.

This is the point: Because the Modernist emphasized the doctrine of the humanity of Jesus and the ideals of tolerance and the Kingdom, because he did not *likewise* emphasize the doctrine of the deity of Christ and the facts of law and sin, he fell away from Christianity in the direction of pantheistic humanism, optimistic determinism, and gregarious relativism.

Fundamentalism resulted from the will to defend some elements of the faith from what was felt to be the invidious attack of "the new science." The Fundamentalist psychology grew out of the conviction that since the Christian revelation is perfect, it cannot be modified or invalidated by human discovery or theory. No Christian would hesitate to accept the wisdom of the book of Genesis rather than the ephemeral dictum of scientific speculation.

It seems inevitable, though regrettable, that the Fundamentalists came to be almost wholly concerned with the affirmation of those parts of Revelation most under suspicion or attack: miracle, the virgin birth, the Resurrection, the plenary inspiration of Scripture, and the like. Yet these things, important and much debated though they were, did not constitute the basic doctrinal center of Fundamentalism.

The predominant Fundamentalist focus was upon Atonement—the fact of sin, and the fact of redemption from sin through the power and work of Christ. The more the Fundamentalist meditated upon the deity of Christ and His sacrificial deed of atonement, the more he comprehended the awfulness of human need and the gracious sovereignty of God.

Could there be anything more Christian? So far, nothing. But the

Fundamentalist carried his recognition of man's dire need to the extreme of complete pessimism, a pessimism which depicted men as so totally depraved as to be incapable of valid thinking and moral behavior. His emphasis upon God's grace and sovereignty but heightened this pessimism, widened the gulf between God and all men to such an extent as to render the Atonement itself virtually unmeaningful.

If man's critical intelligence be wholly untrustworthy, even the verbal inerrancy of Scripture will not provide for man's coming to know the will of God. (Balaam's ass could speak at the behest of the divine will; but it could not understand what it said—unless, indeed, it was more than a beast!) If man be totally depraved, not even the utmost grace of God can be appropriated by him. It was utterly repulsive for the Fundamentalist to think of man as somehow related to an ape; he would have been horrified at the thought of God assuming an ape life; yet, strangely, he did not shrink from proclaiming that God became incarnate in a kind of being infinitely more degraded—on the view of man held by him—than any animal could be! If we are to believe in a real Incarnation, two things are inescapable: that normal human nature must have been such as to allow for that saving miracle; and, that the status of man was elevated in accordance with the vicarious work of atonement.

This is the point: Because the Fundamentalist emphasized the doctrine of the deity of Christ and the facts of God's eternal truth and man's frustrating sin, and because he did not *likewise* emphasize the doctrine of the humanity of Jesus and the facts of man's freedom and his essential moral constitution, he fell away from Christianity in the direction of docetism, nonmoral formalism, and irremediable pessimism.

How all-important is the question, "What think ye of Christ?" Jesus Christ is "very God and very Man." The "and" is tremendously significant. The Eastern Tradition of the Church has ever tended to ignore that "and" by its overemphasis of the implications of the humanity of Jesus—such things as the value of human knowledge, human works, human freedom, and the subjective elements of the Atonement. The Western Tradition has ever tended to ignore that "and" by its overemphasis of the implications of the deity of Christ—such things as the importance of human sin, human faith, divine grace, and the objective elements of the Atonement. This has always been a "minor crucifixion," and never more so than in the instance of the Eastern overemphasis of Modernism, and the Western overemphasis of Fun-

damentalism. The power of the faith is diminished whenever its sacred wholeness and definiteness are violated.

One more illustration: This is of especial interest for us, because it is a "borderline case"—an evidence that the pathology of the past era already threatens the normalcy of the new age. As a matter of fact, if we do not prevent this, there will be no new age! I speak of the issue which has to do with the social gospel, or humanitarianism.

What is involved? Primarily, two things. First, the conviction that only the gospel of Jesus can lead us to an adequate solution of our social difficulties. Second, the contention that humanitarianism (which Professor Calhoun has defined as "the conscious effort to relieve the suffering and to promote the welfare of less fortunate fellow men") is a Christian ideal.

Ma foi! How could these things possibly lead to strife? Listen to two typical accusations: "The 'evangelical Christian' is so preoccupied with the spiritual concerns of time and eternity that he ignores the material concerns of mankind." "The 'Christian socialist' is so preoccupied with the material concerns of mankind that he forgets all about man's spiritual problems."

But there is no real difficulty here. To the extent that both accusations are accurate, both are valid condemnations. If nothing more than this be involved, we simply need remind both parties that it is not a case of "either—or" but of "both—and."

However, there is more involved. The real issue is this: in the light of the fact of the close relation between the spiritual and the material, which is to have first emphasis in matters of social action? When the issue is stated in this way, it is evident that the guilty evangelical has erred on the side of *neglect*, while the guilty humanitarian has erred on the side of *perversion*. If the evangelical has been tempted to forget the importance of temporal affairs in his passion for the eternal, the humanitarian has been tempted to elevate the material above the spiritual in his passion for a better world here and now.

The humanitarian will defend himself on the ground that Jesus always employed the method of working from and through the temporal to the eternal, from the material to the spiritual. He will insist that material reformation is the most effective means to the end of spiritual reformation. And he will point out that material problems, like that of the tenement, are more pressing than less tangible and more abstract problems of the soul.

To which we can have but one answer: that our faith affirms that the chief

End of man is a spiritual End; that our faith affirms that everything material and temporal is designed as the instrument of that chief End; hence, that there can never be a more pressing or concrete problem than that of the ultimate destiny of the human soul. To depart from this affirmation, is to wander off in the direction of the principle which was so influential in the rise of Marxism, namely, Feuerbach's—"Man is what he eats." The Christian is *more* concerned about the moral cripple than the physical cripple. He does not deny that some social maladjustment may lead to a moral maladjustment. But he does insist that sin is something which lies beyond the curative powers of any alleviation of the physical or material ills of man's being and his environment.

If the evangelical be wisely concerned to save men for eternity, he cannot ignore the strategic importance of all temporal matters, since they are instrumentally (though subsidiarily) part of human life, hence part of the whole spiritual situation. The humanitarian can be truly Christian, and still seek to lead men to salvation by way of the reconstruction of society. But primary and secondary motives and Ends must be clearly and honestly distinguished. Why should such distinction lead to strife when we stand in the presence of John Wesley's insistence that the first business of the Church is to save souls from sin, and his phenomenal effort to alleviate human suffering?

Our faith teaches us that any effort to save men from sin must be broad enough to affect the whole life of man. It also teaches us that it is better for a man to lose the whole world than to lose his eternal soul. The evangelical does not tell the whole truth when he says that Jesus did and does it all. The humanitarian does not tell the whole truth when he says that if *we* practice what Christ preached, if *we* imitate what He did, *we* shall redeem our world. Our world need requires that we tell the whole truth, and utilize its power.

III

Religion is the root of culture. The first evidences of significant cultural change appear in theology. If there is any sign that a new leaven is working in civilization, it is not in the muted cannonade of our political contention, it is not in the autumnal spectacle of our variegated and diffuse literature, it is not in the impasse of diverse scientific theories. It is in the spirit of peace and harmony which has come to dwell in the hearts of the watchmen upon Mount Zion.

It is the new mood of theology which warrants our hope that the Age

of Dispersion is ended, that the day of the Kingdom is at hand. On every side we witness fertile ecumenical efforts to unite the peoples of the Church of Christ. This exterior phenomenon is the reflection of something deeper and more important.

For the first time in centuries, leaders of the churches have determined to scrap their peripheral differences in order to provide an adequate leadership for the Church. Christians all over the world are speaking a common language, co-operating in a common enterprise. The last time this happened, there was the fruitful integration of the thirteenth century.

Everywhere there is movement from the edges to the center. Scholars, like Professor Niebuhr and Professor Brunner, have abandoned opposed extremes for a common higher synthesis. For the first time in history, through the work of men like Bulgakov and Berdyaev, the genius of the Orthodox Church is in vital and intimate contact with the genius of the Western Church. Denominations, including the Anglicans and the Friends, are striving to heal the schisms which resulted from conflicting views of the Ministry and the Sacraments. Roman Catholics, like Maritain, Przywara, and Gilson, have become catholic Christian evangelists.

No small part of this serious movement toward organization and definition is the outlawing of false dichotomies. The new catholicism does not countenance such rabid and unexamined antitheses as faith *versus* reason, religion *versus* science, revelation *versus* knowledge, unity *versus* diversity, divine omnipotence *versus* human freedom, Christianity *versus* culture. If the faith has a definite center, it also has a definite circumference; but that circumference includes all that is true. That man belongs to the past age who construes the "simplicity" of the gospel as a denial of its richness, its versatility, its power to represent and cope with the intricate complexities of all life.

The Oxford Conference was a landmark in Christian history, not so much because of what it "accomplished," but because of what it "indicated." Every conceivable point of view was represented. Yet the result was neither a confusion of angry tongues, nor an apotheosis of the individual right to interpretation. The result, as reflected in the Conference literature, was an amazing agreement as to the essential structure and meaning of the faith, and an equally amazing agreement that while that faith must be *accepted*, it must not be accepted in such a way as to violate the fundamental principle of democracy which is a part of the faith.

Enough analysis. The issue is before us. The rose of promise glows in the orient sky. Shall there be a new day in Zion? God's wish is expressed in the Cross which stands eternally on the eastern horizon. But we can blot it out with some midnight of our own creation. There have been other abortive dawns!

In Jesus Christ there is truth and salvation. In Him, God perfectly revealed His will for all men. In Him, the Eternal Order was perfectly established within historical process. In Him, the everlasting Son of God became a man. As a man, He spoke, He acted. What He said and what He did belong within the perfect whole of His mediatorial work.

Shall we again, like the disciples before Pentecost, crucify Him through an idolatrous worship of a few things He said or did? Shall we continue to refuse to share the fullness of His life and truth?

The destiny of our world depends upon our answer. New life came into the world with Jesus Christ. New life will come into *our* world if we permit Him to be born again through our acceptance and utilization of the complete faith. No small part of this new life will be the creation of a dynamic theology which will be for us, in even superior fashion, what the *Summa* was for the thirteenth century. The man in the pew will know what he believes and why, because the mediator in the pulpit has captured the vision of the whole and definite faith. Perhaps we shall come to call this living theology "Evangelical Catholicism." Small matter. What is really important is that the new theology shall reflect adequately that full, sufficient, and healing Light which shines from the darkness of Calvary. Let us then put on the whole armor of that Light.

The Unnoticed Irony of Christ

ALLAN A. HUNTER

A SACRAMENT occasionally resorted to by Christians, but all too rarely recognized as such, is the sacrament of humor. What is a sacrament? It is something vivid and human through which the divine light breaks. Through humor the divine light can and often does successfully break.

One of the most effective of living Christians from across the Pacific has made a suggestive remark: "Laughter," he says, "must be our weapon in overthrowing vanities of every kind. More powerful than pistols, mightier than dynamite, is laughter to dispel the host of entrenched idols of our day."

Many grades of humor, sarcasm, and satire are found in Scripture. Perhaps the lowest is the fierce tyrannical sarcasm that like an angry dog would tear the flesh. Hear this from the sophisticated lips of Solomon's son: "My father chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with scorpions." Then there is the explosive kind of thing where Jacob plays this or that practical and expensive joke on a brother or father-in-law. At last comes satire, where the writer or speaker from his little boat expertly watches the clumsy whale; at exactly the right moment and with a terrible precision he throws a harpoon. The whale is barely aware that anything has happened. Inevitably, however, insensitive though he be, he feels the tugging of the barbed but inexorable truth, and the irony strikes home.

Do you remember how your mother, when you were disposed to put off doing your chores, or getting your algebra out of the way, would gently but oh so candidly sigh:

"Yet a little sleep, a little slumber, a little folding of the hands to sleep."

You pretended you didn't hear. But the gently piercing satire of what your mother quoted was nevertheless neatly cracking your smug complacency. Where did she get it? From the twenty-fourth chapter of Proverbs. Proverbs was a column conducted for many generations and perhaps touched up by many hands. The writer is here recalling how he went by a field of a certain farmer who was slothful and not particularly bright. The man's vineyard was grown over with thorns and nettles and the stone wall was broken

down. The columnist wondered why. He pondered long on the subject. Then it came to him: The farmer was confronted with a chore, something hard to do, like repairing the wall or pulling out the thorns. "Anything," he says to himself, "anything rather than to shiver out there in the vineyard at chilly dawn." Turning over in his warm bed he murmurs, "Just a *little* slumber, a *little* folding of the hands to sleep."

In one of the Psalms is a ruthless touch: "The wicked are enclosed in their own fat." Again, Isaiah's word must have helped to laugh idol worship out of existence. The absurdity of those who defied the first commandment becomes unforgettably obvious: "They worship the work of their own hands, that which their own fingers have made."

The Bible flashes in many a place with accurate, undodgable satire. Jesus uses it again and again with devastating results; devastating, that is, to the forces of evil. Everybody knows how He made fun of the over-pious. How careful they were not to swallow a mosquito! If any drinking water moistened their mouths it had to be one hundred per cent strained pure. So far so good. But before long you see one of these meticulous souls with his jaws open at an angle of eighty degrees and something ludicrously like legs sticking out, and the good Pharisee's stomach bulges ridiculously with the hump and head of a whole camel that he has just absent-mindedly swallowed. More than once in church you have smiled over the grotesqueness of these same sticklers bringing to the temple their tithe of carrots and parsley, but entirely overlooking that larger matter of mercy and justice; or you have visualized one of them standing up in the crowded street, stopping donkeys, merchants, pushcarts and all the rest of the traffic, so that he could pray. And why does he pray? So that nobody shall be ignorant that here stands a holy man of Israel. Jesus looks genially out of the corner of His eye in the direction of one more object of His power to burlesque the unco-guid. "Verily," He gently says, "verily they have their reward." These are familiar instances of the satire of Jesus.

"I came," He once ruthlessly said, "I came to scatter fire upon the earth"—the fire of God's truth. God's truth, yes! And in its penetrating awful light some things that the world takes seriously prove to be downright absurd!

There is a special kind of satire where the speaker says one thing but means the opposite. For example, he may put things in such a way as to seem to praise when actually he is expressing biting reproof. This is called irony. Consider one or two cases of irony in the sayings of Jesus which the Church,

to its great loss, has continued to overlook. The first is a parable that no doubt has perplexed many of you, most of you, for as you read it in the Authorized or even the Revised Version it seems to teach exactly the opposite of what Jesus obviously would teach. Do you picture the Master telling us that we should cheat our employers? Can you imagine Him urging us to fake our business ledgers and put down the figure eighty when it should be one hundred, or fifty when the amount of money owed is twice that? No, you cannot. And all the word-twisting to the effect that if Jesus recommended shady deals He was only talking to Orientals, and anyway doesn't a man have to compromise in this world?—such casuistry simply makes the confusion worse founded.

Or suppose we take, for example, that provocative parable which is found in the sixteenth chapter of Luke. Here it is, in the accepted version: "There was a certain rich man, which had a steward; and the same was accused unto him that he had wasted his goods. And he called him, and said unto him, How is it that I hear this of thee? Give an account of thy stewardship; for thou mayest be no longer steward. Then the steward said within himself, What shall I do? For my lord taketh away from me the stewardship: I cannot dig; to beg I am ashamed. I am resolved what to do, that, when I am put out of the stewardship, they may receive me into their houses. So he called every one of his lord's debtors unto him, and said unto the first, How much owest thou unto my lord? And he said, An hundred measures of oil. And he said unto him, Take thy bill, and sit down quickly, and write fifty. Then said he to another, And how much owest thou? And he said, An hundred measures of wheat. And he said unto him, Take thy bill, and write four-score. And the lord commended the unjust steward, because he had done wisely: for the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light. And I say unto you, Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness; that, when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations."

Do you really think that Jesus is here advising us to compromise as the underworld compromises, to cheat as the world cheats—as if that were to build one's life on the rock, as if that were to be wise? Do you really think Jesus is here saying we should ingratiate ourselves, make ourselves "solid" with those whose greed makes them lie and swindle, as if the worldlings actually did have the power to "receive us into everlasting habitations"?

Not for a moment do you so believe! If Jesus stands for anything, you

know He stands for integrity, straightforwardness, honesty: the kingdom of God at its very least is the kingdom of right relationships.

Did Jesus, then, slip up just this once? Hardly!

How, then, explain His seeming approval of crookedness? Apparently, there is no explanation save to say that most of the translators have completely missed the point. They put down as sober statement of fact what is a laugh-provoking instance of irony, irony of the highest quality.

To get the humor of it, all you have to do is to put a question mark at the close of those last two perplexing sentences, instead of a period. Thus you save not only the ethics of Jesus, which of course never did need saving, but also your own sense of the weakness and ridiculousness of graft.

That is exactly what Professor C. C. Torrey of Yale does for us in his recent book, *The Four Gospels—A New Translation*. This is his version: "So he (the steward) summoned each one of his employer's debtors, and said to the first, 'How much do you owe my master?' He answered, 'A hundred measures of oil.' He said, 'Take your receipt, sit down here and write fifty.' Then he said to another, 'And you, how much do you owe?' He answered, 'A hundred measures of wheat.' He said to him, 'Take your receipt, write eighty.'" So far, both translations are substantially the same. But now, thanks to Doctor Torrey's translation, comes the illuminating flash of irony: "Did the lord of the estate praise his faithless manager, because he had acted shrewdly (for the sons of this world are more sagacious than the sons of light, in the dealings with their fellow men)?, and do I say to *you*, Gain friends for yourselves with base lucre, so that when it is gone, you may be received into the eternal abodes?"

If Professor Torrey is correct, the Gospel of Luke was written in Aramaic. That was the speech that Jesus used, and it was the language in which the sayings of Jesus were first recorded. Luke, a Greek translating into Greek, follows the text as faithfully as he can. The trouble is that the written Aramaic has no question mark. The reader has to supply question marks out of his own imagination. Luke got the obvious questions straight, such as that of the steward, "How much owest thou?" But in this parable he failed to sense that Jesus was not giving His sanction, in a declarative sentence, to questionable conduct. On the contrary, Jesus was exposing, with a question mark, questionable conduct, for what it starkly was. "Do you?" He is asking His hardheaded Hebrew hearers ironically, "do you suppose the boss would *praise* that double-crosser of a steward? Does any one here imagine that I would

tell *you* to play the game of the racketeers in the hope that the racketeers might take you with them to heaven?"

Common sense should have opened our eyes long ago to what Professor Torrey now technically makes clear by a simple question mark. For immediately following the overlooked irony is this unmistakable word of Jesus: "He who is faithful with little is faithful also with much; and he who is unfaithful with little is unfaithful also with much. If, then, you have not been trustworthy with the false riches, who will intrust you with the true?", leading on to that momentous conclusion: "You cannot serve God and Mammon." And common sense should have revealed to us that in the old confusing translation there was a slip somewhere. Unfortunately, common sense is sometimes the last thing that folks take to their reading of the Bible, and some have convinced themselves that this passage is a justification for the dog-eat-dog strategy of producing and selling things, if not for double dealing.

No doubt the shrewd shipowner who carried through a very questionable business transaction got much comfort from those dubious verses eight, nine, and ten of Luke sixteen. You know the story. This shipowner went to an insurance office and took out an option on a heavy policy to protect a certain ship that was on the high seas. Returning home, he got the sad news directly from the crew that the ship had gone down. Hastening to the insurance office he said to the agent, "I want to cancel that order for the insurance policy before it goes finally through: I have just got word from the ship."

"Oh, we're sorry," firmly explained the agent, "but you can't do that. We'll have to keep you to the agreement. We can't let you back out now. Your order will have to go through, no matter what has happened. That's business, you know." The shipowner went off with an easy conscience. After all, hadn't he used the head on his shoulders as did the unjust steward?

The Bible does not need to be explained away but it does require interpretation. So, sometimes, do the sayings of the Gospels. And here is a rule we may safely follow in trying to understand a difficult ethical teaching of Jesus such as that confusing one in Luke. If a new translation fails to illuminate it, then check it with the general drive, the dominating passion of Jesus' mind. Again, if the recorded words seem to go dead against the general spirit of what Christ said and did and died for, and what His purpose lights up in your own mind as being the very best course of action, then do not let those words confuse you. Whatever you do, do not set up a religion on a solitary saying which may also be a profoundly misunderstood saying.

This brings us to another ironic remark of Jesus which, because it has not been recognized as ironic, has caused no end of ethical bewilderment. It, too, is found in Luke, in the twenty-second chapter, verses 36 and 38: "Then said he unto them, But now . . . he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one . . . for the things concerning me have an end." And they said, "Lord, behold, here are two swords."

The old dependence on the sword dies hard. How hard, a shocked world is reluctantly from bitter experience finding out. James Henry Breasted, Egyptologist and author of *The Dawn of Conscience*, says that the impulse in us to use the strong right arm and win physical power over others is a frightfully persistent impulse, an almost overwhelmingly difficult impulse to resist, because it is a million years old. For a million years it has had the right of way in man; otherwise he might not have survived. That restlessness called conscience, which thinks of how the other fellow feels and what God wants, is hardly five thousand years old. Doctor Breasted's prolonged wanderings through the ancient lands of the Near East have driven him to this conclusion: "The insistent monuments now surviving in all those distant lands have been primarily expressions of man's *power*. It is as if his struggle with the forces of nature, a struggle which has now been going on for perhaps a million years, had imbued him with a defiant consciousness that he could win only by fighting his way through." "Today," continues this great explorer of the past, "you may enter one of the lonely valleys of Sinai and find there, suddenly confronting you, the tall figure of an Egyptian Pharaoh carved in relief upon the face of the rock wall. There he has been standing since the thirty-fourth century before Christ, the oldest historical monument in the world. With uplifted weapon he is about to crush the skull of an Asiatic captive whom he has thrust down upon his knees before him. A monument of brutal force, it was a declaration of possession by right of conquest, serving imperious notice on the Asiatics that the king of Egypt had crossed from Africa into Asia and had taken possession of the surrounding copper and turquoise mines." In other words, the belligerent spirit back of that monument is two hundred times as old as the spirit that puts the family of God before one's own security. In even more contemporary terms, the motive that is back of those bombs today dropping in China has two hundred times more tradition behind it than has the motive which animates Kagawa crying to his fellow Japanese: "Let us die for Christ before the war lords persuade us to compromise."

Was Jesus—on the brink of betrayal a few hours before He went to the Cross—overwhelmed by the million-year-old weapon-clutching habit of the race? Is that why He said to His disciples as He faced the desperate crisis, "He that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one"?

What do *you* think? Do you not think that the whole tenor of His life, the whole heart of His teaching, the last thrust of His death on the Cross was on the side of what Breasted calls "the infant conscience of the race"?

Then why, to repeat, did He cry, "He that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one"?

That cry is not on the side of the uplifted arm that would crush in a human skull. It is on the side of something much younger but much more significant than that. That cry is a lightning flash of irony that exposes the very heart of Jesus and, it may be, the very mind of God. "Love," the Master seems to be saying to His friends, "takes a soldier's courage plus a soldier's disciplined alertness—and more. Get all of it you can. Now! We go to test our souls!"

"And they said, 'Lord, behold, here are two swords.' And he said unto them, 'It is enough.'"

Think of it! These friends of His, men upon whom He had poured for three whole years the very spirit of the warmhearted God who would have us be all-including in our good will even as He, the Eternal, is all-including in *His* good will—these disciples so close to Him and yet so far, so incredibly far from seeing what it was He had been teaching them. Can you escape it now, the irony of that cry "It is enough!"?

A young English novelist says that phrase is "the wildest cry, the bitterest sarcasm that ever fell from the lips of man." No, Beverley Nichols, this is not sarcasm! Sarcasm is ill-natured and it tears other people into shreds. This is irony, the tragic humor that drinks the cup of life to the dregs but that, notwithstanding, smiles, feeling a more intimate companionship than before with the sufferings and the eventual victory of God.

That experience of finding one's best friends still half-blind to the things that belonged to their own and Jerusalem's peace—that experience just before the kiss of Judas is bitter. How bitter only the Christ could know. But that raw, ugly experience He transmutes into irony, and what seemed but a dark saying becomes a truth radiant for the world; what seemed but the weakness of a sensitive conscience becomes the power of an unbreakable will; what seemed but the foolishness of an ordinary cross becomes the wisdom of God.

The American Community and the Protestant Church

R. W. FRANK

WHAT does the local community expect of the Protestant Church? It is obvious that local communities differ widely in structure, composition, temper and culture. They vary from the rural neighborhood and village to middletown and megalopolis. Despite this heterogeneity which necessarily involves diversity in local expectations, we believe there is a common denominator of demands which American communities make upon the Protestant Church. These may be formulated in terms of negative, positive, and debatable expectations of the community with reference to the church.

By negative expectations are meant contemporary community taboos upon the church.

1. The community does not want the church to provide an ecclesiastically controlled cultural or community life such as was attempted in the Middle Ages. Our mores and mind-set are dead against ecclesiocracy either in its medieval or Puritan form. Any attempt to reproduce these in America today is folly.

2. The community is opposed to religious or sectarian intolerance. We have come to see that such intolerance is an indirect form of ecclesiastical regimentation through fear or threat. As such it destroys real religious freedom although it may ostensibly support nominal religious freedom. The proliferation of sects and denominations has been the price of the principle of religious toleration and the principle has been worth even this exorbitant cost.

3. The community does not want the churches to be divisive factors that will further atomize community life or obstruct growing movements toward richer community organization. It favors denominational variety and differentiation so long as these do not involve community fragmentation. It would insure the freedom of persons to find their religious satisfactions in accordance with their temperaments, traditional loyalties and peculiar religious sensitivities, but it does not want this freedom to militate against com-

munity well-being. The conscience of the community, at this point, is ahead of the conscience of some religious groups. Religious freedom is not an absolute value to be exercised without regard to other values.

4. The community does not expect the moral conduct of religious leaders to fall below the approved moral standards of the community at any point. Leaders in many other vocations may violate the mores and still continue in their work with more or less effectiveness. Ministers and church leaders cannot. The community is more exacting in the application of its average moral standards to the latter and does not permit them to sit loosely to such norms. Such looseness swiftly undermines the religious power and appeal of the church.

5. The community does not thoroughly respect a church, the moral life of whose leaders and members is merely at the level of that of the community at large. It expects something better, something morally exceptional, of at least some of them. When the church does not foster something above the average in the character, conduct and spirit of the people it is salt that has lost its savor. Communities may try to fashion churches after their own image but they also look to the church to exemplify something higher than that image. Saintliness is not an American religious ideal but communities are nevertheless disappointed when no trace of this spiritual quality appears within the church. I have known some small and otherwise weak characters to survive on the moral strength and be justified by the saintliness of a few members.

These five negative expectations are among the main community taboos upon disapproved modes of church life. In a sense they peg certain gains from past struggles and set a norm below which churches should not sink.

What are the *positive expectations* of the community with reference to the church?

1. At the lowest level, communities expect the church to be the scapegoat for their deficiencies and failures. In view of the claims and pretensions which the church makes, the community feels that this cardinal institution must be peculiarly responsible for the moral and spiritual breakdowns of our life. With this feeling goes the right to criticize it as ineffective in the sphere where it professes to avail most. This feeling and criticism are partly a witness to the community's high sense of the saving function of religion, partly a rationalization of its own moral failures, and partly a revelation of the lingering superstition that the church should save men and communities

by a one-way magical process of redemption without their co-operation or even consent. Churches will always be criticized, not only because they fall short of their high aims, but also because human nature covets a cheap and mechanical salvation. If the community must have a scapegoat, the church is best able to be one. For the church itself always needs to repent as well as to call others to repentance. Better than any other minority group it can utilize this condemnation and sense of failure to achieve a new humility and to challenge both its constituency and the community to more responsible moral living.

2. At the highest level, communities expect the church to be the chief social agency through which the divine influence is expressed on earth. They look to the church to exhibit "the manward action of God" in human life. Basically, men do not want the church to be just a glorified country club, or another humanitarian agency, or solely a community center, or a purely secular enterprise for fellowship. In older terminology they expect the church to be a channel of divine grace; in more recent terminology they look to the church to lift the mind and spirit of men to that ideal frame of reference represented by the words God, and God's will. Men have a hunger for the eternal, for the divine, for God, even though they may repudiate such theological terms. They want the substance for which these shadowy verbalizations stand. They want to know and feel the total meaning and central worth of their diversified activities. They crave some major forms of reference to give perspective, connection and consistency to the successive, piecemeal enterprises and spot-wise values of daily life. We suffer today from a sense of lostness and dissipation of life because we lack a binding and organizing meaning of commanding worth running through the miscellany of our activities.

The community looks to the church to mediate this divine influence and meaning among men. Here is the peculiar and distinctive role of religion. Failing to find "the manward action of God" in the church men seek it elsewhere. The lush growth of quasi-religions in the contemporary world is a judgment of the communities of men upon the failure of the churches to be what men would like to have them be.

3. The community expects the churches to be effective in the religious and moral education of their members, and to be available for such education of nonmembers who desire it. It still regards them as the chief Christian character-forming agencies. It may not co-operate vigorously with them.

In fact, it usually competes with them for the time, interest and loyalty of their members. It thus works at cross-purposes with the churches and in contradiction to its avowed demand upon them. Nevertheless it has not lost a deep-seated conviction that religion supplies a valuable if not necessary enzyme in the personal and moral growth of children and youth.

4. The community expects the church to assist it in meeting and resolving the major personal and social crises which arise in the course of modern life. This is evident in the fact that those who are only "dangling adherents" of the church resort to its offices and outlook at the critical points of their life. The church has many alumni in every local community who turn to it, not always on festive occasions, but very often in the crises and tragedies of existence. And in time of flood, earthquake or major disaster the church is invariably appealed to. There is today a keener appreciation of and stronger demand for the co-operation of the churches and religion as helpers in solving crucial problems of personal and social life. This is the case despite the fact that social agencies and state activity have assumed ever larger responsibility in these areas of breakdown. The churches are more and more called upon to co-operate in a united attack upon divorce, insanity, delinquency, crime, personal demoralization and social disorganization. Because of the ethical sensitiveness and the spirit of sacrificial love engendered by religion, the churches have always done significant "ambulance work" and ameliorative pioneering in these depressed and neglected social areas. As communities gird themselves for a united attack upon these evils and strive to solve them by prevention and prophylactic as well as by the rescue of their broken end products, the churches are expected to be informed, actively interested and devotedly co-operative with other community agencies.

5. A fifth demand of the community upon the churches is adaptability to its social, intellectual and cultural needs. The church that remains unresponsive on these fronts is one in which *rigor mortis* has set in. And communities do insist, eventually, upon burying their dead. Although they seem willing to preserve deceased institutions longer than human corpses, they manage to dispose even of these in due time.

The community expects the church to mesh into its life, to be relevant to its concrete activities and problems, and not to become a fossil specimen or archaeological curiosity. This means, of course, that the church gets entangled with the community and accommodated to it. Herein is a peril. The leaven may lose its leavening quality and be assimilated to the lump. Prob-

ably what usually happens is a partial secularizing of the church. In so far as the church does not become a pure separatist sect, scorn the community and withdraw from it, a certain weakening and dilution of the leaven of religion seems inevitable. But a partial leavening of the community is better than no leavening at all! And by divine renewal through repentance, by prophetic personalities, by critical and purifying minorities, the leaven may become periodically more concentrated and purged of its adulterating elements. It is by this process of concentration and dilution that the saving of the world seems to go on. The local minister is the key factor in the adaptation of the church to the community and he should be the main agent in saving the church from an accommodation that results in its complete secularization.

6. The community looks to the church to be a perennial source of tenderness, compassion, sensitivity and idealism for men. It reverences these virtues even though it may pay only lip service to them. It regards these qualities as rather impractical in the commercial, industrial and political fields. Here, it relies upon cunning and shrewdness, hardness and coercion. Here, the pursuit and exercise of power are the first considerations. But it senses the need for these qualifying, humanizing attitudes of religion and desires their refreshing and healing influence to seep into the processes of community life so long as this seepage does not interfere with the pragmatic pursuit of gain and power. Bertrand Russell has recently said that "although men hate one another, exploit one another, and torture one another, they have, until recently, given their reverence to those who preached a different way of life." That way is the way of universal sympathy and love.

To be an oasis whence flow sympathy, tenderness, compassion and friendliness is still what communities expect of the church. A. N. Whitehead thinks that a literal adherence to the moral precepts of the Gospels, as society is now constituted, would mean "sudden death." But he also thinks that "the progress of humanity can be defined as the process of transforming society so as to make the original Christian ideals increasingly practical for its individual members." That is, the greatness of Christianity consists in its interim ethics. The church is the oasis where this ethic is a little wellspring of new life. To be an oasis of sensitivity and tenderness in a desert of hardness and ruthlessness is something less than many Christians wish for the church. They want it to irrigate the desert and make it rejoice and blossom as the rose, so that it will be fit for human habitation and not remain merely a parched highway for the caravans of trade. It is something, however, to be an oasis; and

it is significant that the community does not want this oasis to run dry. To alter the figure, the church is expected to be "as a nerve o'er which do creep the else unfelt oppressions of the earth."

Upon these negative and positive expectations I believe communities are rather generally agreed. There remain some *debatable expectations* of the community as it looks to the church. They may not be debatable by ministers, church councils, or by the majority of church members, although most of them, as a matter of fact, are. But they are issues on which communities divide and about which there is often vehement disagreement.

1. A fundamental issue is whether the churches should be co-ordinated with the prevailing and dominant ethos and culture of the wider community. The totalitarian State aims at complete co-ordination and control of the churches in terms of its philosophy of life and scale of values. It claims ultimate allegiance. The national community here becomes the supreme social agency through which the divine influence and will are expressed.

American communities deplore and protest against this overt co-ordination of the Church with totalitarianism. However, they not only permit but approve the co-ordination of their churches with American nationalism and Western capitalism. In part, the difference is one of overt versus covert co-ordination of the churches. By naïve or subtle self-deception, they condemn totalitarianism abroad, yet resist the Church's attempt at home to see beyond nationalism and beyond capitalism. They oppose the Nordicizing of Christianity in Germany but favor its Americanization in North America. They desire the Church to be the agency through which the divine influence manifests itself in life. Yet they insist that this divine influence sanction and not condemn or transform the dominant mores and ethos of Americans. They would fashion God after their own national image. They would reduce Christian theism to national henotheism.

American communities are divided over this issue. It is only a prophetic minority that see and seek escape from this subtler, covert kind of co-ordination. It is difficult for modern communities, immersed in a feverish nationalism and a floundering capitalism, to appreciate the universal love-ethic of Christianity and to achieve an ecumenical religious outlook. Some Christians sincerely hold that if the churches cannot permeate our communities with this ethic and outlook, they will be earthen vessels that have exchanged the treasure of Christian universalism for the pottage of Western tribalism.

2. A second debatable issue is whether the Church should directly seek

to influence social change in the direction of a more Christian social order or should confine its task to Christianizing individuals and hopefully trust them to exert Christian influence upon social change. We want no return to the church-controlled society of the Middle Ages. But, do we want Protestantism to confine itself, as it largely has for four hundred years, to the redemption of individuals, permitting the State and business to dominate social change? Our American communities, on the whole, favor this method. The results of such confinement of church interest have not been altogether happy or reassuring, however. The political and economic orders have tended to escape from all Christian aims and standards. Religion has become more and more "the embroidery of life." Our interdependent world is threatened with disruption because it lacks a spiritual principle of social cohesion. In the shadow of recent history and in the light of our knowledge of the fateful role of political and economic processes in the fulfillment or frustration of personality, many do not see how the Christian Church can remain Christian and wash its hands of all responsibility for the direction of social change. They realistically point out that where the Church has been exclusively preoccupied with individual redemption or with the elaboration of its own ritual, it has either been almost completely co-ordinated with the State, as in Germany, or almost completely liquidated by the State, as in Russia.

3. A third debatable issue, if we grant that the Church has some responsibility for social change, concerns the methods which the Church should employ in effecting such change. Should it use only the methods of education, propaganda and persuasion, or should it become a direct pressure group on behalf of certain causes? Both the community and church constituencies are rather sharply divided over this issue.

It is the growing conviction of many, however, that the church, as a cross-section of the community which contains wide differences of opinion on social issues, cannot, with honesty and without hypocrisy, become a direct pressure group unless its membership is overwhelmingly and personally committed to the cause advocated. Where such consensus does not exist, church resolutions tend to become a form of orgiastic verbal behavior which have little moral force but do make for moral self-deception. There is a subtle peril, moreover, in the church's too ready reliance upon social and political pressure methods. For this encourages faith in legal enactment and coercion

as a substitute for trust in moral growth and conviction. The exterior form marks no gain unless supported by interior conviction and conscience.

It would seem that the main reliance of the church should be upon methods of education, illumination, and persuasion. To present facts, forecast consequences, clarify the moral issues involved, stimulate intelligent participation in moral causes among Christians, and point out that voting is the way in which democracies make basic moral decisions as well as elect political candidates, are methods open to use in all churches and too little utilized by them. One thing the churches can legitimately do in the field of direct social pressure is this: they can and should defend the right and support the freedom of radical minority groups to crusade for unpopular moral causes which seem to them to constitute Christian steps forward in social change. These groups are often the pioneers of a better social order. To discountenance or expel them is to drive out some of our most sensitive and far-sighted souls, and this is to multiply sects and increase divisions. The churches should mother such creative, experimental groups, no matter how radical their political or economic views, so long as they exhibit the mind of Christ.

4. Finally, should the church provide a stabilizing outlook, security, and an integrating center of life for men, or should it introduce ferment and create dynamic tensions for them? The American community is divided over this question, although a majority seem to prefer the former service.

The Lynds in their recent study, *Middletown in Transition*, found that many if not most of the churchgoers wanted consolation, reassurance, and stabilization from the church. "So great is the individual's need for security that it may be that most people are incapable of tolerating change and uncertainty in all sectors of life at once. If exposed to stress and uncertainty at many points, they may not tolerate but welcome the security of extreme fixity and changelessness elsewhere in their lives." The church is looked to as an emotionally necessary counterweight to the swift and engulfing changes going on throughout society. This need probably accounts for the persistence of many fundamentalist churches even more than does the hold of traditional orthodoxy. And it is this need which leads progressive churches to utilize mental hygiene, psychiatry, personal counseling, *et cetera*, in the treatment of personal maladjustments. Our nature is such that we cannot stand incessant, unmitigated change. In religion men seek an integrating, stabilizing resource in a world of flux. And yet the church proclaims a gospel that calls for continued repentance, for a change of heart, and that bids men be perfect

as their Father in heaven is perfect. Christianity has for its mission the creation of tensions between the ideal and the actual, between God's holiness and man's sinful nature, between the kingdom of heaven and the kingdom of this world. On the one hand, the churchgoers of Middletown feel they have too many tensions already. On the other hand, the church cannot accept the world as given as a sufficient expression of God's purpose for men. Here is a delicate but deep-going problem for the church. It must both integrate and disturb men, heal and discontent them, give them security and generate tensions. It needs to perform a wise and inclusive ministry to people in a world bedeviled by change.

Two suggestions may be made about this problem. (1) Christianity has in it a strong mystical as well as a pronounced ethical strain. These need to interpenetrate. A sense of possession of God, of the Divine Companion and His support, can be united with the sense of moral tension and struggle. God's will is both a demand upon us and an available sustaining presence within us. (2) People can find integration and stability in old habits and sentiments. But this sort of stability, while it may make men comfortable for a time, renders them unadaptable and may make them eventually most uncomfortable. We have learned more recently that personality can be integrated and stabilized through the adoption of a purpose or a cause which gives unity and yet promotes flexibility. The church should lead as many as possible to achieve this more promising and satisfying kind of stability. At least the young can achieve this type of integration if the older ones cannot.

These then are some of the things which the community expects of the church. There is pretty wide general agreement in the community and within the church about negative and positive expectations. There is a wide disagreement about the debatable expectations. What these debatable issues reflect is a conflict between a segment of the community's definition and a segment of the church member's redefinition of the church's role in community life. Precisely here are the burning and critical issues of the present. They virtually all fall in the field of Christian social ethics and concern the problem of social change. Here is the pang center of the modern church in relation to the community.

It is to be hoped that on these debatable issues the church can win the right to an adequate expression of its social ethic in community life. For its social ethic is an integral part of its saving gospel for men.

Faith and the Making of New Worlds

SAMUEL H. MILLER

MOST of us are conscious that something like a cosmic earthquake has shaken the temple of Western civilization. The great stones of which it was built, are loose, some of the walls have crumpled, and here and there a tower has collapsed. Life is more precarious, uncertain, and men have grown bewildered and hysterical in the midst of such turmoil and confusion. Business men have characterized the prevailing mood accompanying the collapse of commercial expansion as "loss of confidence." A panic of will has paralyzed the energetic captains of industry and business. A storm of black despair has swept over the hearts of the people, with its ghastly harvest of suicide and insanity. Nations, belligerent as they might have been in the old regime, but which nevertheless held together by something they called honor or principle, now have suddenly lost temper and with uncertainty and suspicion rising, forget the rules by which they played the game and resort to a desperate and erratic course of expediency. Progress ceases to be taken as a self-evident fact in such a world, and the religion of humanity is being rudely disillusioned. God was bowed out of the universe long ago, and now mankind seems no longer worthy of man's faith. Lost confidence, confused wills, forgotten honor, exhausted faith—such matters point to the modern Babel where landmarks are gone, patterns are shifting, loyalties and prejudices are bitter, strange vocabularies fill the air, and life is generally distraught and nervous. Something has weakened the binding which held people together and the world has disintegrated, with each nation against every other nation, each class against every other class, and each man against every other man. It is as if some diabolical social poison of great penetrating power had fallen upon the body of society and slowly but with inevitable sureness separated every cell from every other cell until every person was cut off, isolated, every class became self-conscious, and every nation belligerent. What could have worked such damage? In short, how did we get this way?

The past few centuries during which this civilization has been built, present a magnificent panorama of scientific and inventive power. For four centuries we have been accumulating enormous fulcrums of fact for the use

and development of natural power. Science has invaded every dark corner of mystery where facts might hide and with their discoveries ingenious minds have fashioned instruments by which miracles have become the expected order of the day. Engineers and architects, dreamers and geniuses of every kind have built our cities, spanned chasms, irrigated deserts, tunneled rivers and mountains, explored the deep and invaded the skies. In four short centuries, man has grown into a titan of incredible power and cleverness, controlling and developing a domain of unprecedented grandeur.

It would be strange indeed if such a phenomenal development had not affected our whole way of thinking about the world and about ourselves. The practically uninterrupted success with which such power was accumulated was accompanied by a naturally increasing self-respect. So overwhelmingly did his new powers at first fascinate him, and then obsess him, that at last, unembarrassed by any significant setback, man's self-confidence expanded to the dimensions of a world mood, became the spirit of the time, and was expressed and justified in philosophic form. His pride became "touchy" and a matter of dogmatic aggressiveness. The Calvinistic notions of man's depravity and original sin were not so much disproved as merely found inappropriate to the prevailing mood and condemned as an insult to the dignity of human nature. Sin dropped out of ordinary conversation, and sermons as well, as a morbid exaggeration of the slight and incidental flaws in man's essentially good and perfectible self. Idealism more and more took the place of religion, or more often took the name of religion upon itself. Self-reliance became a mightier virtue than devotion to God. Religion was increasingly characterized as otherworldly, and whether it was true or not, it indicated the practical, human-centered mood that made the accusation. It was not long before the pride of progress became de Comte's religion of humanity and Rousseau's humanistic romanticism. God still hovered on the outskirts of the universe, indistinct, nebulous, somewhat vaguely remembered, but no longer a competitor with man's amazing miracle-working. The Renaissance began by discovering man; it is ending, as Berdyaev suggests, with man filling the universe with his own ego. Proudhon gives bold witness of the new spirit: "Already amid the ruins of old beliefs, Man swears by his own humanity; he cries aloud, his left hand on his heart, his right hand stretched out to infinity: It is I who am King of the universe. All that is outside of me is inferior to me. And I, I am subject to no Majesty!"

So out of a magnificent flowering of power, pride has grown until man has

more faith in himself than in God. That was the very opposite of religion's essential mood, therefore not only faith in God dwindled to a shadowy darkness, but religion's whole set of virtues and spiritual disciplines shifted and changed to make room for the virtues and practices of a new religion. To be sure, there was no change of name. Christianity merely became idealistic, romantic, optimistic and humanitarian. Humility fell into disrepute and what was known as self-respect took its place. Meekness became a perplexity and ambition took the lead of the new beatitudes. And with pride and ambition showing the way, individualism followed with a whole set of appropriate beatitudes taken for granted as Christian verities. Nor was this the end of the matter.

Catch again a glimpse of that mighty piling up of power, and like an invisible kingdom within man the huge, imponderable ego growing larger, but blindly unconscious of its limits. It is true that the outer instruments of power were heavy with possible disaster, but was not the inner exaltation of self as perilous? It was this individualistic religion of pride, with its twin virtues of ambition and independence, that struck its roots down into the souls of the masses and bore its fruit in the imperialism of mighty nations, and in these latter days has vaulted to such hysterical egotism in Germany and Italy, where the dictators are merely the mirror of the masses. They are the saviours prayed for and desired by men whose lives had gone slack in a world which had defeated their pride and left them without food for their ego. Their hysterical action is the result of their lack of faith. Their frenzy is a human effort to achieve the divine afflatus they secretly miss. Their pride is at the breaking point and they are driven to extremes to put some meaning, even an artificial one, into life.

For essentially, the anatomy of pride is just this—it grew from power, and all the magnificence power created; then it spawned its moral motivation by ambition, which is pride hungry for more power, and independence, which is pride made self-sufficient. Put the matter in its briefest terms, the process goes from power to pride, from pride to ambition, from ambition to independence—and then, but one more step, slight but unbelievably critical, and independence becomes isolation. Then the world falls apart! The temple of civilization falls stone from stone. Nation glares at nation. Class threatens class. Every man finds himself in a wolf's world, each against all. The pride which built the world, incited ambition to enlarge it, and independence to keep it, now tears it apart like a demon gone mad. Mankind is atomized,

each person barricaded by fear and caution, and the world becomes a crazy no-man's land of barbed wire entanglements crisscrossing in every direction. Babel comes to be real, when each man no longer understands his neighbor or what he is up to, and does not know whether his enemies are in front or behind him. Life's uncertainties multiply and men become hysterical. Pride is a little madness—but let it increase and the monster knows no master. What it made, it will unmake and with fury.

Something of the desolation of a fallen world may be known by the loneliness of man, for, after all, loneliness is the inner consciousness of a spiritual separation and isolation. It is the bitter fruit of pride. I am not speaking of simple human loneliness, known by the young who have not yet built their bridges of understanding with others, or the loneliness of the old who have lost those with whom they shared life, or the loneliness of people in solitary places. I am thinking of the strange loneliness of a crowded world, a city-world so terribly disconnected, so rootless, so unrelated that it breaks from its solitude only in violence. It is the loneliness of man without roots in anything, without bridges of real communication with anyone, without faith that anything they do counts. There is the loneliness of the man whose hands hang at his sides, aching and ashamed of idleness; and there is the loneliness of him whose hands are busy enough but whose mind is insulted by the work to which he must condemn his hands. There is the loneliness of those whom the world has cast off and will not let work, and the loneliness of those whose work the world has not yet learned to appreciate and therefore bluntly refuses. There is the loneliness of those who live by bread and only bread, and loneliness for those whom the world denies bread. This great desolation of the soul is essentially the loneliness of the lost. Their confidence gone, their wills paralyzed, their honor forgotten, their faith exhausted, they have no place to stand, no place to go, no move to make. They are lost just as completely as the man who has wandered through the dark voids of the universe, looking for God, measuring and tabulating and analyzing everything to find a trace of the Creator, recovering enough knowledge to bewilder the earth but not enough wisdom to give him faith and with it peace of companionship. This man is also lonely, lonely in a sterile, barren, hollow, echoing universe made frightening by the dark shadows in man's own brain. Loneliness is being lost, forgotten, disconnected, unrelated.

Man might well have been proud-at first of his power, and then of his independence, but now his loneliness is too heavy a thing for joy. It was easy

enough to laugh God out of the universe, as long as man could be both blind to himself and have faith in what he was doing, but when he saw himself as the war and Freud taught him to see himself, he found the laughter echoing in a hollow sky, and through the long and phantom-ridden corridors of his brain. His fling at faith was a costly joke. For loneliness is like death, the bitter wages of sin. We—and all whom we have mentioned—are lost in a strange darkness of a world without faith, and not yet humble enough to repent.

Lost or lonely, it is all the same thing. Knowing it, standing amid the ruins where pride toppled stone from stone, we seek salvation. To be sure, we call it by other names—a way out, a return of confidence, a new social motivation, but it is nevertheless the cry to be saved from the sterile isolation of our pride, from the terrible stagnation of independence driven on by ambition. Humanly enough, we are blaming everybody but ourselves, and everything but our virtues. For strange as it may seem, our virtues were our downfall. Ambition and independence, fed by pride of power, were the dissolving agents which loosened our world and left us each in our own little darkness.

And now that we are inheritors of such a mood, prepared by four hundred years of historic activity, the question rises as to how we are to break our isolation and bind ourselves to others in relationships creative and vital enough to stand the weight of a new world. For we must build, whether civilization is at an end or not. Man cannot endure the empty void of a world so thoroughly disrupted. The sight of such chaos compels action, even though it be the frenzied action of self-preservation incited by fear and suspicion.

One can see the towers of new worlds rising in the old world where the first breaches came in the walls. There are the huge outlines of Russia, where men build as they must for the sake of life together. And in all their building there is faith, rampant and philosophic, with historical perspectives of hope in the future and definable roots in the past; a faith that man is essentially an economic animal, and that a world may be put together, its individuals related, and its suspicions dissipated when every man has bread and work to earn it. It is a kind of totalitarian capitalism, and everything is sacrificed to economic efficiency.

Over in Germany another breach in the wall is being closed but by a peculiarly different kind of faith. Belligerently opposed to the idea that man is essentially an economic animal, it proposes to put its world together out of a mystical, blood relationship, and her saviours turn against the materialism of the Communists and the geniuses of the economic world, the Jews. It is a

kind of totalitarian patriotism, to which everything else must be sacrificed. Both of these are but outbursts of final fury in the course of pride's disease. In Russia, God is definitely repudiated and man becomes his own god. In Germany, God remains, but only as He is modified for Nazi purposes of patriotic propaganda. Pride, ambition, egotistical independence struts with an exaggerated but nervous air belying its pose of certainty and strength. These new towers are built out of the old stones and on a precariously smaller base for faith. Whether such worlds made out of economic and national motives are strong enough to break the bondage of loneliness is yet to be seen. There seems to be a great deal of arbitrary force and artificial stimulation called into play to create the sense of solidarity in such states. Tremendous pressures are set in motion—all act as one, marching together, working together, uniformed alike, gestures and symbols blanketing the eyes and habits, cries of "necessity" and "foreign oppression," life scheduled, unified, and exciting. Thus men may forget their deeper loneliness, but one may ask for how long?

While it is true that such social activities may break the barriers here and there around our isolation, it is not by any means more than a superficial distraction. Actually it immediately creates a new isolation, the proletariat against other classes and the Nazi Nordic against all other blood. Both leave life without an ultimate reference by which these sectional and partial loyalties may be freed from stagnation by the freedom of a vaster order. Without that each becomes its own reference, a false god, and new depths are dug for loneliness by the mad ego. In short, a new world will never be made, calmly and with unhurried hands, without faith, not merely in each other, but in God.

Such an idea suggests to most moderns an impossible return to some former period of history. Actually it declares only that pride with its twin virtues of ambition and individualism has revealed its true social consequences of disruption and loneliness. It asks how we shall escape from our imprisoned selves or prejudiced classes or egotistical nations, so that life may be shared. It recognizes that we cannot put our roots down unless we believe in something; we cannot build bridges unless we trust somebody; we cannot act with abandonment unless we have faith in something of a destined order, a kind of providence, a capable and adequate God. How shall any new world be built except two or three gather strength from their souls and dare to have faith, though faith is not the order of the day or the spirit of the time?

The difficulty is not that an impossible return to medievalism is suggested, but rather that it is necessary to make an embarrassing repudiation

of the long-respected virtue of pride and its twin conspirators, ambition and independence. As long as these three operate the social order is no order at all, and the new world is thwarted. Yet the repudiation goes further, for it means the positive assumption and practice of certain moral disciplines appropriate to faith. And these, although held now in contempt or doubt, are humility and reverence. That such words should meet with derision is not at all strange. It means merely that they are not understood. How could they be, under conditions of mind produced by their opposites? Although there is little understanding of the social strength and function of these faith-virtues, nevertheless there are two facts clearly evident. First, that faith expressed in terms of humility and reverence did produce a historic community—the Church—which not only endured through the fall of Jerusalem, the collapse of Rome, and the disintegration of medievalism, but created insights for the fashioning of each new epoch. Changed from time to time, its basic convictions nevertheless remained centered in faith, practiced with humility and reverence. It created a lasting “community.” Secondly, despite the embarrassment and perplexity that surround the new moral discipline, the actual circumstances of life are ruthlessly hammering into multitudes of people a humility they would never have chosen deliberately. The situation itself is making it absolutely impossible to escape the knowledge of human limitation and inadequacy. This may be the catharsis of the modern man’s spirit, in the presence of the world’s tragedy, which will leave him nearer the beginning of a new world. To arbitrarily will oneself to be humble and reverent is obviously out of the question, but if there is released in life the ultimate judgment of tragedy, then the humbling of man is not an arbitrary matter but inevitable. That is where we stand now, humbled but as yet unrepentant. Until that comes, the world descends to further chaos. Perhaps it is only in desperation that we learn to bind ourselves life to life, humbly and reverently, that the weight of a new and better world may be carried with joy.

History and the Social Gospel

NELS F. S. FERRÉ

WITH eagerness I waited my first set of papers from the incoming class of our theological school. The students, coming from nearly every part of the nation, ought to reflect, I felt, in the requested description of their view of Christian faith, the best thinking, however immature, of the laity and of the various colleges from which they came. To my surprise, I found that the only unity in the papers was a decided lack in respect to two aspects of Christian thought; there was revealed practically no sense of history and almost entirely no consciousness of the social implications of the Christian gospel.

Now, it is quite obvious that the Christian religion is by its very nature not only an historical religion, but the religion of history. In this respect, Christianity is the extension and the fulfillment of the Jewish world view. Professor Arthur Darby Nock of Harvard once asked me what I considered the earliest competent historical work. When I answered "Thucydides," he fairly bristled at me and at most Christian thinkers for not recognizing in the book of Kings the earliest works of significant historical interpretation. It is not surprising, but quite natural, that Augustine, the great thinker of the Jewish-Christian tradition, by his historical reflections in the *City of God*, should have become the father of the philosophy of history. It is also interesting to observe that in our English tradition, it remained for the early Christian poets and for Bede, in spite of his use of Latin, to give an historical sense to literature and learning. Many Christian thinkers are just now waking up to claim their birthright. With what power Berdyaev, for instance, has stressed that only the historical reason can find fullness of truth, that all individualistic interpretations outside the great traditions which represent the experience of the ages, no matter whether these interpretations be by groups or by eras of history, invariably become thin and lifeless. To reason outside the historical traditions is to fail to find the symbolic meanings and the basic motifs of religion which the ages have brought into clearness, or, to put it in a more positive manner, which God has wrought through history. This discovery of the significance of the historical approach is causing scholars with necessity to interpret the grace of God from within the historic life of the

Church, realizing that it floods most fully through the forms which through the ages have sustained the Christian saints. It is being prophesied that the next great era of the Christian Church will come neither through speculative theology nor through new psychological insights, but through a deepening understanding of the meaning of Christian history as the eternal purpose of God. The historical sense is the faith of the ages, the acceptance of the patience of God, the positiveness of the humbled heart before God's mysterious way with the world, the feeling of a divine will greater than our deepest thoughts.

A profound thinker, the fountain source of modern Swedish thought, Bishop Billing, has seen with unusual depth that Christianity is the religion of history. When he, as a student at Upsala, to which university he came with a literalistic view of the Bible, happened to read Wellhausen's critical works on the Old Testament, he naturally suffered great anguish of soul, but through them he later received the leitmotif of his theology: God's dramatic, prophetic revelation in history through His struggle with evil. The history of religion, Billing points out, has been the history of something *coming between God and man*: in the Old Testament it was the idea of moral laws; in the Greek world, of intellectual laws; in the modern era, of natural laws. He could have added that these natural laws have entered even the realm of spiritual interpretation until some know much more about the psychology of religion than they know about God Himself. As a matter of fact, they seem uncertain about His being at all, so well have they hid Him behind their notions of natural laws.

In any case, Billing definitely dismisses as real all laws apart from God's immediate creativity in the present. Severed from this creative Will, all laws, whether moral, intellectual, or natural, become reflectively produced obstacles to the effective realization in history of God's concrete, creative purpose. The prophets, according to Billing, had a message in terms not of abstractively true ideas, but of a living Will guiding the affairs of men. The history of Israel he conceives of as a bit of history within history, the history of election, in which is condensed the deepest meaning of all history; but *included within it* in the largeness of God's purpose, is the history of the whole world. The Church, to be equal to its task, must have the sense of God's constant nearness; its living fullness can never be the servant of its past course; it cannot live by the smokey candle of its own reflective abstractions from the Will of God as revealed in the past.

Billing's work electrified Sweden. He became the intellectual father of the "True Revolt in the North." To this revolt I can testify, having watched its effects for a year in many crowded city churches in all parts of Sweden. Sweden also has one of the most vital theological movements of our day, led by Bishop Aulén and Professors Nygren and Bring, a movement to which Walter Horton with every right devotes much space in his *Contemporary Continental Theology*, and which can be understood thoroughly only in terms of a new sense of Christianity as the religion of history.

God's Israel contributed more than a mere sense of history to the world, namely the sense of holiness in history. Some outstanding thinkers like Professor Brightman and Dr. Hugh Vernon White have told me that in their opinion Otto's *The Idea of the Holy* is one of two or three of the most basic works produced in this century. Surely he has caught a motif of utmost significance in his description of the sense of the numinous and of the tremendous mystery which finds its highest expression in the holiness of a personal Purpose directly concerned with human history. This Purpose became most fully revealed, not by prophets, but by the Son. In a personal conversation, Professor Whithead recently defined God as "the unity of the universe which gives us a sense of holiness." In view of his philosophy this is important, for it seems that a holy history must move meaningfully to a definite attainment. G. K. Chesterton significantly points out that the fiercest struggle of our day is that between the Cross of Christ and the circle of endless historical repetition. The final clash between Christian and non-Christian thought may well be whether the meaning of history is repetition or the receiving by the Cross the promised Crown.

My students' papers also startlingly lacked a consciousness of the social implications of the Christian faith. This astonished me in view of the recent general popularity, to a great extent, no doubt, faddish, of the social gospel. The reason for this lack, I think, is that the social outlook has been viewed as an accompaniment, however necessary, of the Christian faith and not as the Christian faith itself. The sense of history and the sense of Christian sociology are not unrelated. If history is, as Plato held, merely "the shadow of eternity," then one ought to escape from the cave of historic existence into the sunlight of the unchangeable peace. If, on the other hand, history is a period of grace, merely an opportunity of decision for eternity, then men should surely not be concerned with social and political situations, as the Swedish students intimated in a recent number of *The Student World*, but

should, instead, bear witness of a full and free salvation away from the evils of this sinful world. In this case, there is in this world no Christian sociology in terms of a Christian kind of fellowship applicable to the common conditions of social life. If history, once again, as Hegel taught, is where eternity is at work, or in the unforgettable words of George Herbert Meade, is "the locus of reality," then a Christian faith is meaningless apart from a Christian sociology. Many outstanding thinkers are coming to this point of view. This is the burden of Brightman's article "Three Conceptions of Culture" (*Philosophia*, Beograd), and of Tillich's insistence that the sense of history is not one of a detached search for facts but arises out of "questions of embarrassment," out of the sense of importance connected with vital historical decisions. If social action is to be firmly founded in Christian faith, sociology itself must be grounded in the sense of a holy history under the judgment of God.

Many thinkers almost sneer at sociological Christianity as a stage happily outgrown. Many of us may have a personal history at this point. When enthusiastic about the social gospel, we preached our churches tense on the subject of social action, only to tire of it, turn away from it, and demand a "real religion." Yet Christianity is by its very nature two-dimensional, which to deny is to deny itself. Christianity is the good news from God through Christ that the meaning of history is the achievement of freedom and faithfulness in fellowship. This fellowship cannot, however, be attained apart from God's work in history through His Church. The Christian Church is the full incarnation in human history of the divine community. The actual Church may fail of this vision, but in its eternal and catholic sense it is the embodiment in time of the Spirit of the living Christ which is by its very nature effective of a new type of sociology.

All human sociologies have but one dimension; the divine has two. It has a vertical as well as a horizontal reach. Only through God's love in Christ, operating through worship to give His Church pulsing power, can our social problems be solved. The call of all conventions and of all cultures must heed the call of God. If history, as Doctor Sigerist of Johns Hopkins maintains, is "spiraling toward socialization," there will be collective destruction too horrible to contemplate unless this socialization is under the guidance of God; for without Him society cannot steadily suppress its collective complexes. Evil in society finds ever new forms beyond the power of man. The push of progress in history is a calamity when severed from the pull of God's purpose.

Holiness in the service of love cannot endure social evil, but it is, never-

theless, free from all unloveliness. Professor Whitehead recently told me that he was afraid of morality at white heat, because it can seldom be maintained at that level, except by a very few, without becoming confused with sadistic narrowness. Sociology, to be Christian, cannot take the kingdom of God by violence. It wins its victories slowly even when it must become a cross triumphant through first being trampled under foot. If the Christian Church be founded on the love of God, social transformation is not so much its task as its very nature.

Evidently, as my students' papers indicated, the Church in vast areas is without a deep sense either of history or of Christian sociology. Israel throughout its arduous history was borne up by its consciousness of being God's special people. The Christian Church must likewise understand the significance of the fact that it is the special embodiment of God's love which yet knows no barriers, now or ever, which was prophesied in the suffering servant of the Old Testament, but made historically concrete in the teachings and life of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The Meaning of Mysticism for Christianity Today

PATRICIA GRADY HAMMONS

MYSTICISM will continue to contribute to Christianity in the future as it has in the past, since it peculiarly fosters and sustains certain values of profound religion, such as worship, discipline which promotes that purity without which we may not see God, and immediate apprehension of the divine. Today, however, Christianity has problems facing it which are peculiar to the modern temper. Thus mysticism should have a specific significance for modern Christianity or be considered inadequate. Here we shall emphasize the especial significance of mysticism for the particular problems of modern Christianity, rather than its value for all ages.

The modern man is inclined to scoff at a philosophy of mysticism. Traditionally associated in his mind with subjectivism, abnormality, and quietism, he prefers a philosophy which will permit more normal religious experience. However, pure mysticism never exists except in theory, for unmodified, it would lead logically to complete annihilation of the self. Further, it would project a false unity onto the world and deny the practical ethical dualism which exists. History, institutions, the demands of this life have always imposed restrictions and conditions upon mystical philosophy, never permitting it to exist in pure form. It has managed to get out of hand frequently, as when Suso practiced such terrible austerities upon his body. It has degenerated into the selfish practice of ecstasy for its own sake and turned away from the problems of this world into the life of the soul.

Today mysticism needs redefining. For majorities of men it is a word associated with the occult and mysterious. It needs to come into recognition as an important spring and fructifier of Christian experience throughout the ages. Christianity perpetually needs a mystical element present in its body, one which recognizes the dangers of pure mysticism and avoids them. For the vigor of mysticism can be retained for Christianity, when it has been sheared of its superfluities. The immediate experience of the eternal is the central fact of mysticism. This does not necessarily imply ontological fusion, which is so often thought to be integral to mysticism, but interpreted in its

broadest sense, means that the soul can immediately experience the presence of God. Mysticism interpreted in this way cuts across that type of Christianity which describes God as completely other, and brings to light that immediate consciousness of the divine which Jesus possessed.

Christian mysticism, which we are considering alone, is necessarily of a unique character. It affirms a God of righteous will who is Creator and Redeemer, acting in history for the realization of value. Thus we will not expect to find in normal Christian mysticism a doctrine of the One such as is set forth in the Vedanta philosophy. Neither will that acosmism be discovered in Christian mysticism which is to be found in Eastern thought, because the God of Christianity is conceived of as acting and redeeming in history. The experience of the eternal which Christian mysticism offers has its roots in the New Testament in Jesus' immediate awareness of the Father and in Paul's recognition of the indwelling Christ. The mystical element has re-emerged persistently in Christian thought since, hence it is of the utmost importance to consider the relation of mysticism to Christianity today.

Three distinctive challenges must be met by any way of thinking or of life which is promulgated today—the challenges offered by the scientific, religious, and social temper of our age. Can mysticism, as it has here been described, which is both a way of thinking and of life, accept these challenges and offer something from its store, or is it irrelevant to them?

1. *The scientific challenge.* Since the last century the scientific method has been greatly extended in its application, and generally accepted. It measures our world in concrete terms, whereas mysticism in contrast seems vague and unreliable with its excursions into uncharted territories. Our tendency today often is to bow down at the feet of science and pronounce it all-sufficient. Mysticism's claim to possess immediate knowledge of divine reality seems to be erected on weak foundations in contrast with the measurable bases of science's verdict.

Yet, when we consider the territories which mystical experience and scientific analysis explore, they are discovered to be not completely alien. The dominant scientific trend thinks of our universe as evolutionary and emphasizes its potential immanent creativity, as the thought of Henri Bergson and of Whitehead indicates. Both the quantum and the relativity theories postulate an indeterminate element in reality. Thus has modern science conquered mechanism and given assurance that the universe is not entirely measurable. There are areas into which science cannot penetrate; there are

surgings of life in the universe of which we cannot say, "It is finished." Creative evolution in some form persists.

The purpose of mysticism is to infuse the love and will of God into this world. We believe that an enlightened and refined Christian mysticism can accept science's verdict and fulfill it. Bergson, Whitehead, Eddington, and Jeans, all these scientific thinkers support this belief. Science cannot measure all of reality, for its own findings assure itself that there is this nonmeasurable creative element. Mysticism can bring the richness and strength of its first-hand experience of the eternal into meeting the problems set by science. It can offer that same spirit of authority which science gives, for throughout the ages the characteristic result of mystical experience has been the surety of its knowledge. It can ally itself with the principle of creativity which science assures us of and interpret it religiously. This is perhaps mysticism's most significant task in its co-operation with the scientific enterprise. It is able to work out the religious counterparts of the scientific positions which science itself cannot do, and it can show us how we can act as determinants in God's redeeming action. Science describes our universe. Mysticism acts upon that description with effecting power.

Henri Bergson, one of the great philosophers of science today who has come forth as an interpreter of mystical religion, exemplifies this co-operation of mysticism with science. He declares that mysticism is the establishment of a contact with the *élan vital*, or the creative impulse, which is of God, if not God Himself. Thus, for Bergson, the mystical intuition completes creative evolution. This French philosopher has not worked out adequately the religious statement of his scientific thesis, that the *élan vital* is struggling to overcome materiality, but the direction is indicated where science and mysticism may enlighten each other in mutual co-operation.

The testimony of science today regarding the nature of reality is not sufficient, for its testimony needs to be supplemented and acted upon. The intuitions of mysticism complete the affirmations of science, which standing alone can only be understood partially.

2. *The religious challenge.* Today we are torn between such conflicting positions as Liberalism and the Crisis theology. Mysticism can offer both specific and general contributions to our religious thinking at this point. It may supply impetus to all branches of endeavor, as it need not be confined to the limits of any one sect or position. Its gift of the immediacy of the divine to life is one that should be sought in all types of religious thinking.

What is the function of mysticism in religious thinking today? Bergson affirms that its task is to give light and life to static societies and religions, that religion is to mysticism what popularization is to science. Nicholas Berdyaev, the Russian interpreter of history, on the other hand, suggests that mysticism can never be the organizing principle of mankind, that it is essentially aristocratic. Somewhere between these two extremes mysticism will find its function in the contemporary scene. We have indicated why Christianity can never be completely mystical, yet have suggested that its possession of a mystical element preserves profound Christian experience. Mysticism must be welcomed into Christianity insofar as it strengthens its historic insights and adds creativity to the conservatism of religion. It assuredly can supply the intuitive epistemological principle which is necessary for true religious knowledge. The contribution of mysticism in the field of epistemology is of the utmost significance, for its use of intuition makes a unique pathway of knowledge for the seeker of truth. Mysticism can also impart the vitality emerging from its immediate apprehension of the nature of God and in this way fructify all religion. This last is mysticism's most characteristic and perhaps most fundamental service.

These are mysticism's general contributions to religious thinking today, if they will only be seized upon and employed. In particular, mysticism can deepen and enliven the shallowness and meliorism of modern Liberalism. Fresh from its contact with divine reality, humility and adoration follow in its wake. It is able to destroy the God which Liberalism has made in man's image, the God who has been leveled down to human stature. Real mystical religion, such as that of the great Catholic modernist, Baron Von Hügel, brings with it a sense of both the otherness and the likeness of God in relation to man. Only as these two aspects of the divine nature are preserved, can we have profound religion. Mysticism can preserve both these aspects for us. It can lift up the social immanentism of much religious thought and show that a God who is to be worshiped as Redeemer is not one with the social process. It can serve as an antidote to the extreme supernaturalism of the Crisis theology, correcting its position by describing God as both "incomprehensible and indefinitely apprehensible." It can add to the Crisis theologian's message of the sickness of the world the glad news, the gospel of the joy of God. Where the letter destroys it can make life blossom anew by bringing the gift of the Spirit, as in Fundamentalism. To Protestant and Catholic alike mysticism can yield the vigor which the mystical experience proffers and act

as a unifying factor in Christianity. Perhaps the most real hope for fundamental, not formal, Christian unity, lies in discovering those values which mysticism fosters, the life in the spirit, rather than by the letter.

3. *The social challenge.* This is our most immediate and most pragmatically important concern. Capitalism has passed from its expansion stage to contraction and a new society is in the throes of birth, but this society can come out of the old only with guidance. Can mysticism act as midwife at birth?

Mysticism is able to meet the social challenge today only if it acknowledges the value of that deeper community for which we are now striving in the social order. It can face the social challenge, if it possesses this insight, and be an effecting force by sustaining that heroic love which is necessary for farsighted action. Only faith, as Baron Von Hügel so wisely perceived, can supply a sufficiently deep, steady, and tender love and service of our fellow creatures, precisely where they most require, because they least deserve, such selflessness. Mysticism can provide this never-failing impulsion for service because of its closeness to the eternal, and can supply the long-range view, both of which services secular Socialism cannot perform for itself. Mysticism can avoid both the secularism of Socialism and the extreme supernaturalism of Karl Barth and present God as Redeemer, effecting His purpose through our co-operation in the social struggle.

A corrected Christian mysticism can abolish the this-worldliness of the modern social gospel and the other-worldliness of "salvation" Christianity, by showing that eternal life is begun in part here, that it is a profoundly social force to be understood only through social relationships. A Christian mysticism can correct materialistic Marxism by indicating that the social process does not complete reality; eternal life is to be understood completely only hereafter, it is our link between two worlds.

In a stimulating discussion Bergson suggests a concrete application of mystical religion to the social order. He declares that men can be freed from the bondage of the machine age, not by less machinery, but by the intelligent and spiritual use of more machinery. Mysticism can free mankind through more mechanization, by guiding the machine with the creative power of the mystical intuition and spiritualizing the prevailing standards of tastes and values. This concrete grappling with the relation of mysticism to the social order welcomes science as the ally of religion in changing the social order. It brings down or rather rediscovers in the world the eternal, and points the

way toward liberation from the standards of modern materialism which deny that the spiritual is the real. In such a manner can mysticism bring perspective and also immediate resources to our social problems.

In such ways as we have indicated mysticism can do service for Christianity today. Likewise, modern scientific, religious, and social thought can render a reciprocal service to mysticism. Only in reciprocal interaction can there be fructification of one by the other. Mysticism's central thesis, that the eternal is experienced immediately and directly, can be maintained, while its traditional excesses and fanaticism can be destroyed. The mystical element should be reinfused into Christianity, making it surge with new strength and see with new vision. This mystical element must be healthy, avoiding all acosmism and pantheism, and seeking eternal meaning in historical existence by correlating itself with Christian theism. We plead not for a thoroughgoing mysticism, for that would be a negation of Christianity, but for the retention and rediscovery of that mystical element in religion which will best sustain and re-create those values for which Christianity has striven.

The Bible's Revolutionary Relevance

BASIL MATHEWS

REVELATION *OU* REVOLUTION" was the slogan printed in French on posters fixed to the notice-boards of churches in Geneva not long ago. They announced evangelistic services based on Bible study. I confess to feeling as I saw them a school-boy wish to go round in the night with black paint and a brush and place a "p" before the "o" of the middle word, and an "r" after the "u." The *ou* should, I feel, be *pour*. "Revelation for Revolution," not "Revelation or Revolution," is the meaning of the Christian faith. The gospel is not an escape from change; it is the leaven that transforms. In a world like that in which we stand, in the grip of evil forces, the Cross must inevitably be the symbol of a more radical revolution than those linked with the Swastika or the Sickle.

For surely anyone who takes his Bible realistically as expressing the mind of the Creative Spirit who is "God the Father Almighty," must see—in face of the hellish forces loose in the world today—that God's will carried into action in the historic present would work a revolution beside which that of Communism would "pale her ineffectual fire."

The reason why Swiss citizens should fear revolution is, of course, obvious. Switzerland, with Nazi despotism looming from the northeast over her German-speaking population, the Fascist rule on her southern frontier facing her Italian-speaking population, and the pseudo-Marxian Tzardom of Stalin spreading a totalitarian pall over the horizon, sees them all as a menace to her unique democratic federal self-government. Between the devil of the Hitlerian drive of blood and soil and the deep-sea of proletariat dictatorship, she is filled with a deep loathing of all revolution.

Yet Communism, National Socialism and Fascism give meaning to life for millions just because of the conviction that revolution is absolutely essential if life is to become tolerable for man. They are messianic efforts to lead mankind into a new community of ordered life out of the impossible injustices and intolerable inequalities of contemporary life. The alternatives then for us today are not: "Shall we or shall we not have revolution?"; but "What kind of revolution shall we have?"

Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, Mussolini's *Autobiography*, the Marx-Engels Communist Manifesto, with *Das Kapital* are in the strict sense prophetic writings. They burn with fiery zeal. They denounce evil. They promise a golden age. Can we say truly that the Bible has the relevance for today that the Communist, the Nazi and the Fascist find in these? Can the Bible give new meaning to the life of the millions atrophied by unemployment, to the victims of the tragic mess that an invading Western civilization makes of the lives of Asiatics and Africans; to the tortured peoples caught in the cogs of race antagonism; or to the disillusioned youth to whom the gospel of having a good time proves to be a *cul-de-sac*? Has it light to shed and guidance to give to the multitudes of us for whom the new psychology has added its intoxication to the heady wine of natural instincts? Does the Bible give a convincing word in a world where the quest of sensation and self-realization have set a goal of being in place of the old insistence on discipline and subordination?

Nowhere does the message of the Bible stand for the *status quo*. From the first page of Genesis where God sees chaos and brings out of it order and rhythm, and flings life and light into the abyss of death and darkness, all through the books to *Revelation* where He says, "Behold I make all things new," the theme of the Bible is the will of God at work to transform the life of man. This is true wherever we place ourselves in the whole story. The pictures of His will at work are all revolutionary. Swords are to be beaten into plowshares and spears into pruning-hooks; aliens become members of the household; the wilderness blossoms as the rose; in place of the totalitarian despot "a king shall reign in justice."

If we inquire where lies the root of this revolutionary character of the Bible, it is discovered, of course, in the fact that God is revealed as the God of history. Other faiths like Buddhism and Hinduism see the goal of man's life in escape from the illusion that this material order is real. The Bible, affirming the reality of this material order, reveals God as endlessly concerned in molding it and in redeeming man into whom He has breathed the breath of His own life, but who is also the prodigal son. In the Bible the mind and the heart of the Eternal thus speak direct to the mind and the heart of man. The climax of the revelation is the logical completion of that process: the Word is made flesh, which gives to us ultimate revolution; the transformed life of personality.

Is, however, that process relevant today? Each message of each prophet

in the Bible is, of course, strictly and immediately pertinent to the crisis that called it forth. Yet each of God's spoken words comes home to every age and to all similar occasions; it has its practical relation to that situation, both as light on the meaning of the scene and as power to lay hold of the crisis and wring good out of the evil in it.

What God said to Moses and did through him in freeing a people from Egyptian bondage and in leading them toward unity and liberty in a promised land, has meaning for the life of all empires and for all subject and oppressed peoples, as the Negro spirituals so vividly show. Jeremiah experienced what fills us with horror today: the terror of a small nation under menace of absorption by a titanic neighbor; the destruction of youth in slaughter, the tension of long desperate strife, food-shortage and famine; the shaking of faith in God and in goodness. Jeremiah suffered the inner tensions that bring agony to any Christian leader today. He saw war marching on his land like an inevitable doom, and therefore, while himself passionately desiring peace, denounced the easy prophets of false peace. Aflame with desire for the freedom of his nation, he was driven to counsel submission for captivity for his own nation as God's judgment in that crisis. All the torment that the tragedy of China and Abyssinia, Spain and Czechoslovakia brings, as the successive waves break over us, he faced in his day on that bridge of land between the despotisms of the Nile and of the Euphrates. The eternal principle on which his dicta were based, and the act of listening to the voice of the Eternal as giving the final word for our obedience remain valid today. Similarly no labor leader is more vehement in his onslaught against the profiteer than was Amos who cried:

"They have sold the poor for silver,
And the needy for a pair of shoes
And sell the refuse of the wheat."

Our economics are much more complicated than were those of his day, but the judgment is timeless.

The words of Ezekiel who tried to comfort exiles weeping by the waters of Babylon, come with strangely intimate relevance to exiled Russians scattered across the world, to thirty million Chinese uprooted from their ancestral homes, and to those refugees of many peoples driven distracted across frontiers—exiles who endure fathomless misery of organized distress on a scale that mankind has never seen before.

The confessional church pastor in Germany and the Korean commanded

to perform emperor worship under Japanese rule, find in the words of Jesus as to the duty of the Christian to Caesar a twentieth century message.

Youth faced with his problems sees in the Bible young men setting out on the adventure of life, and can find in God's familiar dealings with them, relevant light on vocation and a career, marriage or ambition. The Bible drama shows that God is working always in the field of man's life waiting to be understood; that He is speaking every day, waiting for ears to hear; that He is ready to say something to each of us and to all of us, to give guidance in facing each concrete situation with which man is confronted.

What we see throughout the Bible, then, are the God-given insights of the human spirit throwing light upon events, giving guidance toward action and nerving the will to decisive deeds. We may take as a supreme example the prophets' interpretation of events in the eighth and seventh centuries B. C., ending in the Exile. They revealed the will of God for the Hebrew nation, and in fact saved that chosen people from absorption and extinction. The later prophets carried forward from that suffering the Messianic vision which led straight on to the decisive hour of all history when by God's own revolutionary act the Messiah came. The guidance found in the Bible is not that of escape, as it is in Hinduism, it does not lead man away from tragedy; but so transforms him and the whole scene that he can go through it with the Lord who, stepping out toward Gethsemane, said: "Be of good cheer; I have overcome the world."

Lyman Abbott

EDWARD SMITH PARSONS

IT was my good fortune to have been associated at Amherst College with two of the sons of Dr. Lyman Abbott; Lawrence Fraser, in later life president of the Outlook Company, and Herbert Vaughn, for many years professor of English at Smith College. These intimate college and fraternity relationships, together with the fact that my brother sang with Lawrence as a member of the '81 quartette, a somewhat famous musical organization at Amherst in our day, brought my brother and myself into close friendly associations with the Abbott family.

It happened, in the spring of 1885, when I was a student of the Yale Divinity School, that Doctor Abbott came to New Haven to deliver an address. In the course of a call upon him, I asked if he had any suggestions as to work I might do during the summer. He said at once, "Come to Cornwall and help me." He had undertaken to define the religious words for the Century Dictionary, and needed the help of someone who would be called, in modern parlance, a research secretary. It was a rare opportunity and privilege to do such work under such a man, and I eagerly accepted the invitation. Early in June I arrived at The Knoll, the Abbott home at Cornwall-on-the-Hudson, where I was received most cordially as a member of the family, and was soon busy about a most interesting task.

The Abbott family, at that time, was made up of the doctor, his wife and their six children. Mrs. Abbott, a daughter of Dr. Cyrus Hamlin, one of whose distinctions was the founding of Robert College, was fully worthy to stand by the side of her great husband. She had rare intellectual and social gifts. For many years she edited, as "Aunt Patience," a column in the *Christian Union*. She had a very extensive correspondence and with her letters and her literary work kept a stenographer almost as busy as Doctor Abbott kept his. She made a practice of reading for Doctor Abbott important books and magazine articles and passing over to him their essential facts and ideas. She was the soul of hospitality and entertained a continuous stream of guests. They found her a delightful conversationalist, interested in life from all angles, able to express herself with clarity and to bring out the best in her circle of family and friends. Her deep interest in young people brought immediate response.

Lawrence, the eldest of the children, had graduated from Amherst four years before. He strongly resembled his father—tall, slender, dark, musical to the tips of his fingers. The resemblance was not only in form and feature; it was also seen in mannerisms of action and speech. He had the social gifts of his mother and was possessed of great charm.

Harriet, the older of the sisters, was a young woman of fine insight and taste and of wide and deep sympathies. Her abilities were equal to those of the others of the family, but, alas, they were housed in a frail body.

Herbert was just graduating from Amherst. He had a beautiful spirit, and combined in delightful fashion taste, humor and literary appreciation. In later life, as I have said, he was professor of English at Smith College.

The three younger children were Ernest, a boy of sixteen, just ready to enter Harvard—he became in later life successor to his father as editor of the *Outlook*—Theodore (Ted) and Beatrice (Bonny), both most interesting children. Theodore has become one of the leading physicians of New York City. Beatrice was most attractive in appearance and character and possessed, in a high degree, the Abbott sensitiveness.

The family group was intensely individualistic—intellectually keen, high-strung, emotionally responsive, interested in all that was going on in the world, and eager conversationalists. Under such leadership as the father and mother gave, to which the children vigorously responded, there were no dull moments in the household. At the long table, at which there were almost always a few, sometimes many, guests, there was humorous and racy talk, kindly banter, as well as serious discussion of topics of current and perennial interest.

Doctor Abbott himself, as all who knew him will testify, was a most striking figure, with his slender, lithe form, and quick nervous movements. His head was most unusual—almost an inverted pyramid, with massive brain space. As he grew older and his beard grew white, he came to resemble more and more the ideal of the Hebrew prophet. He had great intellectual power, the ability to see to the center of a problem and to analyze clearly its essential elements. He had an imaginative, even a poetic gift, one manifestation of which was the beauty and aptness of the illustrative material of his addresses. His thinking was his own. He knew traditional thought but he was not dominated by it. He had the ability to see deep into truths which had been obscured by familiarity. This grasp of the deeper realities made it possible for him to interpret religion to many who were groping amid for-

mulas, traditions and observances which had become meaningless to them. The title of a stimulating little book he wrote expressed his fundamental mission—*In Aid of Faith*.

One element of his intellectual strength was his ability to lose himself in his work. When I began my service Mrs. Abbott remarked to me that I must be sure to arrange for myself suitable conditions of work. Her husband, she said, would not think of such matters, as he could work anywhere, under any conditions. This power of intense concentration, combined with his analytical ability, made it possible for him, after he had mastered his material, and this was done rapidly, to put it into form with very little after revision. He dictated all his literary work.

Like others who have this gift of preoccupation, Doctor Abbott was at times very absent-minded. I have a vivid mental picture of one occasion on which he exhibited this trait. It was in the early part of a Sunday dinner. The long table was full, for there were guests, and Doctor Abbott was about to serve his youngest son. Turning to the boy to ask him what he wanted, he began to call him one after the other by all of the family names. Finally the youngster, who had waited long for his dinner, brought the recital to a close by slamming his hand down on the table and shouting: "Ted's my name, Sir!"

Among the many guests at The Knoll, none was more interesting than the then president of Wellesley College, Miss Alice Freeman. At that time she was more like a college sophomore than a college president, she seemed so young and was so thoroughly alive. The two of us who had the privilege of climbing Storm King with her had an unforgettable experience. She had a fund of good stories, many of which came out of her college experience. One of them I recollect. She had talked on several occasions to the Wellesley young women about promptness at the chapel service, which was not one of their virtues. One morning, when the bell had just rung, she heard much scurrying along the halls, and, suspecting the cause, she was not surprised, when she came on the platform, to find every girl in her place. The service began with a hymn, and that morning she gave out

"Early, O Lord, without delay,
We haste to seek Thy face."

The girls tried hard, but without success, to find out whether this was coincidence or premeditation.

Great as was Doctor Abbott's intellectual superiority over others, there was nothing dictatorial about him. He was always generosity itself. In all our relationships, I, a callow youth, was treated as an equal and with the greatest kindness and consideration. He took the trouble, in the midst of his busy life, to share with me the wisdom which had come to him out of an unusually full and rich experience.

Shortly after I began my work at Cornwall, Doctor Abbott went to Lake Mohonk to attend one of the conferences held each year in that celebrated resort by the friends of the Indian. At this particular gathering it was decided to push the policy of granting to the Indians land in severalty, thus making a beginning of their absorption into the citizenry of the country. The morning after Doctor Abbott returned home, he went up to his "den," a little room on the second floor, at the head of the stairs, where he did his close thinking and gave his dictation, and after perhaps an hour he called his secretary and gave her a series of editorials covering the differing phases of the subject, to appear in successive issues of the *Christian Union*.

Another glimpse into his habits and methods of work he gave me during a conversation one evening on the porch overlooking the Hudson. Not all who knew him were aware of the fact that he started his active life as a lawyer. At that time he played the organ at Doctor Beecher's church in Brooklyn. He was a natural musician and could improvise with ease and sometimes with disconcerting results, as Mrs. Abbott once told me; for sometimes, unconscious of their origin or associations, he would weave popular melodies into his preludes and postludes. But the ministry drew him away from the law, and he studied with his father, Jacob Abbott, of the Rollo books. His first charge was in Fort Wayne, Indiana, where he remained two years. At the end of that time he resigned and returned to the East, utterly discouraged about preaching. As he expressed it, he found it impossible to prepare and deliver two "orations" each Sunday.

He made, in the East, a new start, this time in religious journalism, and he made his home at Cornwall-on-the-Hudson. The little Presbyterian church at Cornwall, or Canterbury as it was called, back from the Hudson, was vacant and he was asked to take the pulpit. His reply was that he had no time to prepare sermons, but if the church wanted him to talk to them on religious themes on Sunday mornings he would be glad to do so. They were happy to accept his help on these terms. Early in the week, he told me, he would decide upon his subject, and he would be thinking about it through

the week. His reading and his daily experiences supplied material which contributed to the development of his thought. On Sunday morning after breakfast he would go to his den and think his material through. He would then jot the outline down in his notebook. During the drive to church he was usually very silent, and during the hymn which preceded the sermon he kept his seat and went over his outline again, glancing at his notebook if in doubt about a point. During the delivery of the sermon this notebook lay unopened on the pulpit. He said that often the best thought of the delivered sermon had not occurred to him in his preparation but was entirely the fruit of the moment.

Sometimes, during an animated discussion at the Sunday morning breakfast table, a new and more pressingly vital theme would suggest itself to him, and he would substitute that for the one about which he had been thinking through the week. Such spur-of-the-moment sermons were usually among his very best.

He told me that with the adoption of this method of pulpit preparation, his career as a public speaker began. Invitations to give addresses began to come in, and he followed the same habit for them as for his sermons, continuing this method the rest of his life. He had the advantage of a very logical and analytical mind, one which was fertile in suggestion of thought and illustrative material. His objection to the use of outline notes was that such material, lying before him on the pulpit, induced him constantly to attempt to remember what had been in his mind rather than to work creatively. Instead of going out to his audience, his mind was working back toward his old material.

He added that in preparation for public address he sought at the outset to make two things clear—first, to define clearly his theme, and, second, to make definite the purpose of his address, what he wanted to do with his theme.

An interesting illustration of Doctor Abbott's skill as a public speaker and of his ability to handle successfully several lines of thought simultaneously happened one morning when he went, as he often did, to preach at Wellesley College. When he began his sermon he noticed that a young woman near the front opened a book and settled herself down to read. He determined he would make her shut her book and listen to him. It took a little time to accomplish the result, but finally the book was laid aside and she gave him her undivided attention.

His handling of another and more difficult situation shows his presence

of mind and his ability in an emergency. He was asked to give a talk to children on a Sunday evening in a community not far from Cornwall. It was at one of his very busy times and he decided to use an address he had found useful for such occasions. He drove over in the early evening and arrived after the congregation had assembled. The church was apparently well filled, but with adults. He said to the person who was ushering him in that he understood he was to talk to children. The reply was that the committee knew that people of all ages would want to hear him, so all had been invited. Doctor Abbott said he could see a few children scattered through the audience but none that could be addressed as a group. He realized his address would not fit the occasion, so when he was settled on the platform he prayed as he had rarely prayed before. In his own words which he used in telling me the incident, he told the Lord He had gotten him into this scrape and He must get him out! He then took a new subject, thought it out as best he could during the opening exercises and then gave what Mrs. Abbott told me was one of the best of his addresses.

Doctor Abbott believed in recreation as well as in work. One morning he announced that all work was off for the day as Mr. James Stillman of New York, who was a great admirer of the Doctor, had invited the family to join him for the day on his steam yacht, the Wanda. So we all boarded the yacht, steamed south through the Highlands, which took on new beauty from such a vantage point, and anchored opposite Scarborough. There we were taken ashore and driven to Mr. Stillman's farm on the hills east of the river, where we were shown the buildings and the stock. I remember vividly the milk room with its dazzling tile and spotless cleanliness. After this inspection we returned to the Wanda, where lunch was served as we sailed back to Cornwall at the close of a perfect day.

Another incident of the summer is still more unforgettable. During that summer General Grant died at Mt. McGregor near Saratoga Springs, New York. The body was brought to New York over the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad. On the day the journey was made, we took rowboats to a point near the east bank of the Hudson river and watched the cortege pass. First came the pilot engine draped in black; then followed the funeral train—an engine, a baggage car and a coach. As we sat and watched the solemn procession, we realized we were looking upon one of the memorable events of American history. Doctor Abbott was a sincere admirer of Grant, though he recognized the General's faults and his errors as President,

and this attitude added to our appreciation of the uniqueness of what was happening.

Viscount Samuel in his *Belief and Action* has pointed out the fact that the "casual" is also the "causal." I trust I may be permitted to give an illustration of this fact from the experience of the summer, and of what resulted.

One evening Doctor Abbott was expressing to me some criticisms of the theological education of the day—I was, as I have said, at that time a student of the Yale Divinity School. He said that if he were studying for the ministry he would not attempt to get his theology from the seminary courses, but he would take his Bible and work out his theology for himself in a western parish. "I would go to Colorado, or some other western state," he said, "and let my theology grow out of my study and work on the field."

I did not follow his advice to the extent of giving up any of my Divinity School courses, but at the close of the three years of study—I planned to take a postgraduate year—I decided I wanted a summer's experience of preaching and pastoral work, and determined to follow Doctor Abbott's advice and "Go West." It happened that my father, at the time, was a member of the executive committee of the American (now Congregational) Home Missionary Society. He said that the next time he was in the office of the society he would talk to the secretary about my wish, and he added: "Where do you want to go?" I replied that I knew nothing of the West, never having crossed the Mississippi River, but remembering Doctor Abbott's casual illustration, I said I should like to go to Colorado. As a result, there came in due time an invitation to take a summer pastorate in a tiny plains town north of Denver. Later I was called to the Park Congregational Church of Greeley. After four happy years there, I accepted a call to the professorship of English at Colorado College, which was to have large growth and influence under the efficient leadership of President William F. Slocum. There I gave twenty-five years of service, followed after a short interval by seventeen years at Marietta College. Doctor Abbott's chance use of "Colorado," to illustrate his point about theological education, determined the direction of my entire future life.

So for me, as for Viscount Samuel, "casual" is only a rearrangement of the letters of "causal" and has the same meaning. And the rare privilege of a summer with Doctor Abbott, working for him in his home, was the fateful experience of which the determining influence has not yet passed.

Saint Augustine as a Mystic¹

F. J. FOAKES JACKSON

THE Hulsean Lectureship in the University of Cambridge was instituted in 1819 and is analogous to the Bampton Lectureship at Oxford. Both foundations have enlisted the services of some men of remarkable ability, and they have produced books which have become almost classical works of English theology. Naturally the merits of the Bampton and Hulsean lecturers have greatly differed in quality; but Mr. Burnaby's *Amor Dei* deserves to rank with Doctor Liddon's lectures on the Divinity of Christ. These two differ in many respects, but it is not our object to contrast them further than to point out that Doctor Liddon's addresses are those of an eloquent clergyman, while Mr. Burnaby's display the ripe scholarship of a lay mind. The one is essentially characteristic of Oxford, and the other of Cambridge; each university having its own merits. It is, however, perhaps desirable here to remark that the Bampton lectures referred to are sermons, while these Hulsean are a running commentary on the works of Saint Augustine of Hippo.

Of all the patristic writers Augustine is one of the most attractive of personalities; and the effect of his philosophy has been widespread and enduring. Even if we fail to appreciate the saint, or to understand the philosopher, we are drawn to the man. If he had not the scholarship of Saint Jerome or the statesmanlike capacity of Saint Ambrose, he is more human than either of his great contemporaries; and his character can still appeal to our affection. Fortunately, Augustine still lives in his *Confessions*, which can be read with real pleasure by us as they are marked by the candor which shows him as boy and man without any affectation of false piety or lurid descriptions of a sinful life before his conversion. Augustine's early home surroundings seem to have been as commonplace as those of a modern youth brought up in a small town amid middle-class conditions. His parents were Patricius and Monica, his mother a devout Christian, and his father, if coarse-minded, had at least the sense to realize that his son was of unusual promise and deserved an exceptionally good education, even at the sacrifice of his slender resources.

¹ *Amor Dei*.—A study in the religion of Saint Augustine. The Hulsean Lectures for 1938, by John Burnaby, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1938. \$3.50.

Augustine's early career was like that of many a clever undergraduate. He formed boyish friendships with his fellow students and made plans for an ideal life with them. He tried the fashionable religions and philosophies of his time, notably Manichaeism, and found them unsatisfactory; he was greatly influenced by the Hortensius of Cicero, a dialogue on the contemplative life which now only exists in fragments. The fact is that Augustine was one of those brilliant youths, whose ardent desire to satisfy the aspirations of a restless intellect led him to embrace views which his natural common sense in the process of time caused him to abandon. The chief charm of the *Confessions* is that Augustine tells of just the sort of experiences any very brilliant and original youth might have passed through on his way to high academic preferment. The entire book must endure as one of the most human documents of antiquity.

The merits and defects of Augustine as a thinker and theologian are traceable to his severe academic education. He relates incidentally that he was able to read and understand a difficult treatise without the aid of the author's diagrams, a proof that he had all the trained ability of a logical mathematician in his power of recognizing the natural conclusion of a difficult and involved argument. But excessive reliance upon a logical process often leads to unsatisfactory results; and this is exemplified in his theory of predestination which he reached by following the rules he had acquired. Yet his knowledge of men and his amiable temperament prevented him from proceeding to any uncharitable extreme. To him love was infinitely more important than logic. Mr. Burnaby's lectures throw light on Augustine's great and complex character.

It must never be forgotten that it was the mystical element of the Christian religion which mainly attracted Augustine. It was only when he realized what the solitaries of Egypt were doing for Christ that he finally decided to accept Baptism. Herein lies his difference from much of modern Christianity. Men are prone to ask whether their religion has done much to benefit social conditions and improve the world; in other words, whether it has in all these centuries proved of practical utility. They feel that their religion has been of little use unless it has enabled them to take their part in bettering mankind and adding to the sum of human happiness. This is a laudable attitude, but it is a mistake to attribute it to Saint Augustine, whose supreme object is union with God and attainment of the knowledge of the truth.

Augustine, like many earlier converts, was greatly influenced by Plato

as interpreted by the Neo-Platonists, especially Plotinus, whose spirituality seemed to find satisfaction in Christianity, and this great thinker would have found it difficult to understand the practical trend of modern religion. His object was to attain to the knowledge of God and enter into a mystical communion with Him. As a distinguished classic and Platonist, Mr. Burnaby is just the man to interpret this father with sympathy and intelligence. The great problem is, "How can we love, as we are commanded to do, One whom we have to regard as the supreme ideal of all goodness?" Again we may well inquire, in what sense can this God be said to love us? *Love* in truth is a most comprehensive word for which the copious Greek language has many terms describing its different aspects. Of these we may take three—*Eros*, *Agape* and *Philia*. As applied to God, the primary meaning of *Eros* is a longing to acquire Him; *Agape* (in Latin *caritas*), a higher and purer affection; and *Philia* would imply association with God in mutual friendship.

The problem how we are to be united with God by *love* is approached by Augustine from the standpoint of a Neo-Platonist, according to whom the finite and the infinite are divided by an impassable gulf. To bridge this gulf is this father's task. I think it would have been difficult for him to accept the words of the Catechism that "our duty toward God is to *love* him," if only because *love* must be a spontaneous act, without any sense of obligation; and every impulse of this kind must be a grace and not a merit. The consequences of such a view, if logically followed, must lead to the most absurd conclusion, but Augustine's knowledge of human nature and his practical good sense repeatedly appear to prevent him from arriving at it.

To praise Mr. Burnaby for his style, arrangement and knowledge of his subject would be superfluous, if not impertinent. But this does not mean that his ten lectures are easy reading. They are marked by very close thinking, and demand careful attention. All that can be attempted here is to select a few typical passages and leave the reader to form his own conclusions.

The Hulsean Lecturer thus explains the Platonism of Augustine:

"Augustine's Platonism is manifested in the centrality for his religion of *amor Dei*—the love of God which appears in men as the pursuit of eternal values and the delight in whatsoever things are lovely. His Platonism is Christian because he finds the Supreme Value and the most compelling loveliness in the love which is God's own Being; and because he believes that *amor Dei* is God's gift of Himself to His children—a gift which, offered in the divine humility of Christ's Incarnation and Death. . . ."

His first lecture is a somewhat severe criticism of the antimystical school of religion, which maintains that active benevolence is incompatible with the life of contemplation. This very superficial view is answered by a single question: Did Buddha's religion cease to be mystical when he chose the active service of others?

The conclusion of this discussion of Augustine's and the present-day conception of the function of religion is especially valuable.

When we reach the chapter on Platonist Christianity we feel that Augustine was saved from the realm of speculation and theory by having been soundly educated and at the same time being kept during his long life face to face with the practical problems of life. As Bishop of Hippo, amid the drama of the decay of Roman civilization, he had to keep in constant touch with the actual facts. It must not be forgotten that many of his treatises are sermons addressed to mixed congregations.

One passage in Mr. Burnaby's lectures deserves to be quoted at length as giving a keynote to much of the system of Augustine and to its influence on later ages. The Pelagian controversy made him develop his strongest convictions, and set a permanent stamp on all his theological method of thinking. The idea that man can so order his life as to save himself without the direct assistance of Divine Grace was especially repugnant to a man like Augustine, whose experience led him to believe that he owed nothing to himself but everything to having been chosen by God's mercy. This led to some of his followers imagining that they were irresponsible agents in God's hands, to be damned or saved according to His will. As a protest against this, Pelagius and Celestius declared emphatically the freedom of man's will to obey or disregard the divine Law, and thus in Saint Paul's words, "to work out his own salvation." Of course Pelagians and Augustinians alike tended to push their opinions to absurd logical conclusions; and, as in the Arian controversy, a school arose of mediators between the two extremes under the name of Semi-Arians and Semi-Pelagians. Mr. Burnaby introduces us to one of the most interesting of these supporters of moderate views in Bishop Julian of Eclanum. In his third lecture on the *Beata Vita* our author says:

"Stranger to Augustine and more interesting to us was the attitude of Julian of Eclanum, that singular champion of rationalist enlightenment, who seems to have been born fourteen centuries out of due time. Julian, seeing in Augustine's doctrine nothing but a vilification of the nature which God made good, asserts the moral indifference of concupiscence, understood as man's natural tendency to seek satisfaction for his animal desires, and the wholesomeness of the contest through which he is enabled to

confine their satisfaction within due bounds. As usual, much of a tedious controversy could have been avoided if the disputants had defined their terms. The words *concupiscentia* and *libido* as used by Julian meant the desire regarded in itself, a natural good because implanted by the Creator, but no more than the raw material of morality; to Augustine the same words signified a desire already disorderly and perverted, the flesh already in revolt against the spirit. Julian had the best of the formal argument, for Augustine ought to have admitted a distinction between the desire itself and the disorder in the soul which makes the desire unruly. But where Augustine saw anarchy, Julian saw merely the possibility of excess: in his view the moral life is a sort of boxing match, a fight between friends to be fought without passion or rancor; and to Augustine the perversity of such an attitude was as manifest as its sanity has become to many minds today."²

We have here a conception of sin which Augustine combats with all his strength. Sin is defined as an abuse and perversion of natural instincts, and the sinner needs purification and discipline rather than regeneration. To Julian the body appeared to have been created with appetites which should be controlled; to Augustine the flesh was the enemy of the spirit, and could only triumph by special grace, because the most natural affections were a sign of our having been born with sinful inclinations inherent in us.

The problem of sin in the Pelagian controversy seems to have disturbed the Eastern Christians comparatively little; but in the Western Church, once raised, it has never rested. It never slumbered in the so-called Dark Ages; it divided the medieval scholastics; it raged in the days of the Reformation; Catholics and Protestants found themselves internally at variance on this subject. How it will reappear in the enlightened days of the future has yet to be seen. It is here enough to say that among the Fellows of Trinity, three distinguished men have appeared to interpret Augustine to the University of Cambridge; the late Doctor William Cunningham, Doctor Tennant and now Doctor Burnaby, and we sincerely hope that we have not heard the last of the Hulsean Lecturer of 1938.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 59-60.

Religion for the "Plain" Man

R. BIRCH HOYLE

A STRIKING feature in recent books is the attempt to win the ear of the "average man," the "man on the street," "plain John Smith." A generation is growing up that has never been to a Sunday School, whose only appearances in a church are at christenings, weddings, funerals and national celebrations, like Thanksgiving Day in the United States. To such plain folks much of the language of religion and theology "cuts no ice;" it uses words like "incarnation," "original sin," "justification," "sanctification," "objectification"—words which convey little meaning outside church circles, into which plain folks seldom enter. To such people the Bible is, like the book in *Revelation*, a "sealed book."

What E. E. Aubrey says of "Christian Faith in the American Scene" in his striking book, *Living the Christian Faith*, is true of Europe also. He says "dependence on the laity has forced American Christianity to develop its theology in less traditional terms," and he points out that "there is grave danger in this; that the depth of theological inquiry may suffer by an attempt to restrict examination of our religious assumptions to the levels comprehensible by minds untrained in theology." In other words, religion may become shallow and thin, or vital elements of teaching may be whittled away, in the effort to reach "outsiders."

Praiseworthy is the group of recent books endeavoring to "open out" the meaning of the Fourth Gospel. Canon Redlich of Leicester (England) has written in simple speech of the problems of the historic worth and the riddle of that Gospel in his *Introduction to the Fourth Gospel* (Longmans). Canon Peter Green of Manchester devotes a book entitled *Our Great High Priest* to expounding the seventeenth chapter of that Gospel; a book devout yet couched in popular language. The Archbishop of York has issued the first of two volumes, *Readings in St. John's Gospel*, in which he explains the teaching of the first twelve chapters (Macmillan). He frankly states that his book "is not intended for scholars or theologians:" "it is an attempt to share . . . what I find to be my own thoughts as I read the profoundest of all writings." Yet scholars and theologians cannot but be interested in Doctor Temple's remarks about, say, the cleansing of the Temple, put, in contrast

with the Synoptic Gospels, early instead of in Christ's last week on earth; the raising of Lazarus, and the sacerdotal attempts to get the Eucharist into the Discourse at the feeding of the five thousand. Scholars will wonder whether the standpoint taken is compatible with the "Doctrine in the Anglican Church" over the Commission of which Doctor Temple presided. Whether or not, the book will appeal to ordinary folks and make that Gospel more real and wonderful to such readers. And a new way of considering that Gospel is opened up by Dr. P. Gardner-Smith in *St. John and the Synoptic Gospels* (Cambridge University Press). He takes up point by point the common assertions that the writer of John knew and corrected statements in Mark and Luke. He brings out the great differences between the Fourth and the First Three Gospels when narrating the same incidents, and suggests that independent traditions—in fact a "new source"—lie behind John. Our leading British Methodist authority on the Fourth Gospel, Dr. W. F. Howard, has told your reviewer that this book will have to be seriously re-examined by scholars. At any rate, the patient comparison with the Synoptics will prove fruitful and deepen the sense of religious values to be found in John.

Religion is first of all a way of living, before it can become a theology. To many "religion" connotes gloom, pessimism, denial of life and natural pleasures. A valuable corrective of such a view is given in the collection of papers—fifty-two in number—which were originally contributed to *The Methodist Recorder* by the late A. E. Whitham (*The Pastures of His Presence*, Hodder & Stoughton). There is rapturous joy pulsing through the book, tears a-plenty, yet a gospel for pain and sorrow and death's anguish; a sane and sunny outlook upon life, so refreshing in these days of fear and trembling. A distinguished Anglican scholar, on reading this volume said, "How is it that I never heard of this man before? He writes as well as R. L. Stevenson." The plain man who reads this book will covet such a glowing, colorful, vital experience.

Dr. W. B. Selbie, formerly Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford, has a suggestive book in The International Library of Christian Knowledge Series, entitled *The Validity of Christian Belief* (Nicholson & Watson). He says, "The older I grow the more clearly I perceive the danger of identifying Christianity with any of those dogmatic forms in which it found fit expression in the past, and the more convinced I am that theology must learn to talk in language understood of the people." He knows how to talk in that tongue. "He that runs may read" helpful things on the relation of Religion

to History, Philosophy and Psychology: on the Divine Initiative to redeem man, as seen in the Incarnation in Christ's work, the "Power from on High" felt in the Holy Ghost; with its results in man's release from sin, fear and death. Much theological lumber is consigned to the discard by Doctor Selbie, while the essential things are seen in true perspective. In old age, Doctor Selbie's "bow abides in strength" and sweet serenity marks his mind.

The cool, careful judgment that marks all Dean Matthews' work is manifest in his book *Christ*, in the new series on "What Did They Teach?" (Blackie). To the nonprofessional reader the clear, competent statement of "Our Sources for the Knowledge of the Teaching of Jesus" is a capital introduction, summing up the latest research. The Dean of St. Paul's thinks Form-Criticism "has produced little of value beyond unverifiable conjectures." The great themes of Jesus' teaching are put very freshly, but at the end, as he says, "Jesus does not allow us to treat Him as if He was merely a teacher. He challenges us to say what we think of Him and not only what we think of His doctrine."

An unusually good book for the thinker is Norman Macleish's *The Nature of Religious Knowledge* (T. & T. Clark). How do we come to know of and about God—yea, God Himself as the "Thou" confronting the human "Me"? is the main theme. He examines the theories of knowledge in general, as given by Descartes, Schleiermacher, Jung and Otto. His contention is that religious knowledge is a species of general knowledge, such as we get of an objective world, of persons. He traces the historical process of man's gradual awareness of some Divine Being, in Greek, Hebrew, and Christian religion, especially studying how Jesus came to know God as uniquely His Father. With this book may be grouped Professor L. A. Reid's *Preface to Faith* (Allen & Unwin). The difficulties for the modern mind of accepting the Creeds, and the perplexities involved in thinking of Jesus Christ as "God-man" are sympathetically stated. Some will think the book's title should be "Preface to Doubt;" for miracle, an incarnation, the virgin birth, bodily resurrection of Jesus and even His "sinlessness" are seriously challenged. And yet one feels that the writer is honestly seeking truth and God. He severely handles the Anglican Doctrinal Report, and while expressing gratitude for his colleague's (Canon Quick) *Doctrines of the Creed*, states his difficulties.

The plain man is to be pitied if ever he tries to understand why there are so many varieties of Christian churches. If he does so try, in H. E.

Symonds' *The Church Universal and the See of Rome* (S. P. C. K.), he will be taken through the relations between the Eastern churches (Greek, Syrian, and so forth) and the Latin church, during the first ten centuries, till the Great Schism Council of Bishops claimed the powers which the Papacy later claimed as its monopoly. Scholars will appreciate the immense mass of valuable material collected in this book—a veritable storehouse.

Those interested to see how a Romanist scholar reacts to the Ecumenical Movement, and outlines a program to lead to the Reunion of Christendom cannot afford to miss *Divided Christendom* by Father M. J. Congar, a Parisian priest (Bles). The non-Roman attitudes and objections are well-stated—one can hardly say refuted—and there is evidently, in this writer at least, a feeling of uneasiness and regret that churches should be separated. But his program, while suggesting close, corporate study of all attitudes, starts with an assumption that "Rome" has all the truths, which other churches possess but in part!

Book Reviews

Christianity and Economics. By SIR JOSIAH STAMP. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$2.00.

LORD STAMP has written another book on the Church and its attitude toward economic problems, entitled *Christianity and Economics*. It follows two other books of his, *The Christian Ethic as an Economic Factor*, and *Motive and Method in a Christian Order*. The present volume under review "is intended for the reader who, while prepared to ponder the problems, has not much previous acquaintance with them, but yet knows something of the need of religious endeavor and also of the economic world."

The conclusions on which the author bases his discussion are these:

1. Christ's teaching had primarily a spiritual and not an economic emphasis.
2. Attempts to find guidance in economic problems from the letter of Scripture usually fail.
3. The Scriptures do not favor any particular plan of economic or social life.
4. The teaching of Christianity has been responsible for moral betterment in the Western world through its emphases on pity, justice and the right of the individual.

The chapter headings are "The Economic Background of Christian Teaching," "The Teaching of Jesus Christ to His Times," "Christian Doctrine on Economic Affairs in the Past," "The Fundamental Christian Principles," "The Attitude of the Church at the Present Day," and "General Considerations and Conclusions."

After an examination of social life in the time of Jesus, and His teaching for His time, the author writes about the influence of that teaching in subsequent centuries: "Christian ideals have permeated

society until non-Christians, who claim to lead a decent life without religion, have forgotten the origin of the very content and context of decency."

For the attitude of the Church today the author examines the Papal Encyclical of Leo, published in 1931, the pronouncement of the Oxford Conference in 1937 on "Church, Community and State in Relation to the Economic Order" and the Industrial Christian Fellowship's pamphlet on "The Church and the New Economic Order."

In his general conclusions, Lord Stamp says:

1. In a discussion of ethics in economics there is required a balance in interpretation, and a knowledge of both fields.
2. Much preaching on social issues confuses by ethical heat without economic enlightenment.
3. You cannot have righteousness by statute. "The task of the Church is to be teaching a behavior beyond the compulsory standard; the task of the Christian is to be living beyond it."
4. The task before the Church is to see how far the group to which the individual belongs can have an extension of the principles that should control the individual.
5. Economist and preacher, humble with the accord of past failures, and visionary with the record of Christian evolution, may join hands as the architects of a nobler age.

While those of us who advocate economic change and social reform may be impatient with the conservatism of some conclusions, every reader will profit by the scholarly and thoughtful presentation of the author's views. Every preacher in America ought to read this book.

IVAN LEE HOLT.

Dallas, Texas.

The Apocrypha. An American Translation. By EDGAR J. GOODSPEED. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. \$3.00.

THIS is an American contribution to world-wide Biblical scholarship. It is the first translation from the original text of the fourteen books which were popular in the early Church, and have been retained in the Scriptures of the Roman Church, but which for most Protestants have been sacrificed to the Puritan desire for a shorter Bible.

The reader who approaches this collection of books with a feeling that they are esoteric will soon be brought to realize that they deal with the same sort of human nature we meet with now. There is a contemporaneous familiarity about the statement of Sirach—"The man who builds his house with other men's money is like one who gathers stones for winter." The inquiry of the three guardsmen of Darius as to what is strongest would be timely in any age. One said wine, another the King, the third woman, and all of the guardsmen agreed that truth is mightiest of all.

This book will help to an understanding of the world into which Jesus came. There are passages in *The Wisdom of Solomon* and in *Ecclesiasticus* which should find their way into any collection of devotional literature. The epic adventures of the Maccabean heroes are fully as stirring as any tale of Sir Walter Scott.

Brief but enlightening introductions to the various books are supplied. The vibrant yet dignified style justifies the closing comment of *The Second Book of Maccabees*—the style in which the account is composed delights the ears of those who read.

JOHN W. LANGDALE.

Book Editor of the
Methodist Church.

The Conversations of Jesus. By FREDERICK KELLER STAMM. New York: Harper and Brothers. \$2.50.

I LIKE this book. It does not smell of the cloister lamp, but it has about it the fresh springlike savor of a Christianity which is "The Way" of life. The minister of Brooklyn's Clinton Avenue Community Church, and preacher of NBC's Sunday morning "High Lights of the Bible," has gathered into a generous book the conversations of Jesus, and has given a practical, human, and inspiring interpretation of each of these conversations. One is a bit surprised to discover how much of Jesus' ministry was with individuals, and how much of His teaching has come to us out of conversations. It is the very informality and pertinence of these conversations which we miss with our pomp and ceremonies, and to which we must return if we are to make Christianity vital and personal today. Doctor Stamm has given us a unique book, which will be a worthy addition to any expository library; a book that truly needed to be written, about an area of Jesus' teaching too often treated superficially, or ignored entirely.

The theme of this book is refreshing, timely, and potent—that the conclusive evidence for the truth of Jesus, for His right to the lordship of life, is not to be found in the dogmas of theology, in the authority of a book, nor in the prestige of an ecclesiastical organization, but in His consideration for human life itself.

Our particular day is inclined to a sort of naturalistic bigotry, which hitherto has divorced itself from Christianity, because it wants "evidence" of a practical nature for its beliefs. Here is the evidence, which any unbigoted, truly scientific mind can accept—the historic consideration of Jesus for human life.

WILLIAM THOMSON HANZSCHE.

Prospect Street Presbyterian Church,
Trenton, N. J.

A Puritan in Babylon. By WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$3.50.

THE Kansas editor looks at the Yankee politician and with shrewd observations, keen appraisals, and dogged persistence tracks his subject (neither victim nor hero) through the decades.

Some college prank involving the volutions of a potbellied stove down a dormitory stairway; young Coolidge questioned disclaims responsibility—"It wasn't my stove." True to form he meets the successive emergencies of life from then on to the oil scandals—"not my stove."

"Money honest" refusing lucrative positions, unsmirched by any suspicion of ever having been bought, he "avoided the big problems" (as he said to Will Rogers) and so "became an attitude rather than an executive" (so says Mr. White). On the verge of economic earthquake, "a time of momentous decision," "the President apparently knew nothing of it. Certainly he did nothing about it."

"A man who has been President is not free"—no business offer (there were plenty) allured him after his term. He died a relatively poor man, earning every penny—and making it "work."

Praise there is—but "faint praise" that often amounts to damnation. Fair is the author and painstaking. His sources are many of them personal. Sometimes it seems as if it hurt him as a friend to tell all the truth—but he does it.

Coolidge was shy and taciturn. White charges it up to the repressions of a Puritan background, his mother's death, and (later) to his boy's. "Plymouth never entirely died out of his heart. Inside him that little boy—sentimental, mischievous, sometimes inconsiderate and cruel—never grew up."

New Hampshire's governor stood by Governor Coolidge for five hours during a parade when the Rainbow Division

came home after the war and Coolidge spoke to him just once in the five hours! At a White House week-end, when the Whites and a few intimate friends were present, the President was almost dumb except one night when sitting next to Mrs. White he talked at length to her. It was after his boy had died—the White's had lost a girl of twelve!

General Edwards, under criticism for some war statement, met Governor Coolidge. "Hello, Chatterbox," ventured the general. "Well, General, I notice what I don't say gets me in less trouble than what you do say." "His habit of silent cerebral cogitation made him conspicuous sometimes but never notorious," comments the author.

"While I have differed with my subordinates, I have always supported loyally my superiors." . . . "Stated cynically and therefore not entirely truthfully, this means that Calvin Coolidge always knew on which side his bread was buttered."

There is a lot of character-revealing, history-making gossip here, picked up as only a newspaperman can pick. And then deleted and appraised as a good biographer should—and as only William Allen White can.

Mr. White has a knowledge of economics, of wartime history, of politics and of American life and middle-class psychology that admirably fits him for his task (at times it seems like his labor of love). He is critical and appreciative; he preaches little but hits hard. He reveals an era and a dynasty, now gone forever.

JESSE HALSEY.

The Seventh Presbyterian Church,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

First Chapters in Religious Philosophy. By VERGILIUS FERM. New York: Round Table Press. \$3.00.

THE treatment of this book falls into

two parts. The first section deals with the fundamental nature of religion; the second section deals with the essential corollaries which flow from a theistic assumption.

Professor Ferm does not attempt a highly technical interpretation of religion. Rather he lists a number of case studies which suggest the universality of religious expression among diverse groups and levels of mankind. After cataloguing many interesting types of religious belief and practice, he attempts to crystallize his findings in a comprehensive definition. "To be religious," he says, "is to effect in some way and in some measure a vital adjustment (however tentative and incomplete) to whatever is reacted to or regarded implicitly or explicitly as worthy of serious and ulterior concern."

The second part deals with the cardinal themes in religious philosophy, such as arguments for belief in God, theories of value, evil, the soul, human freedom, prayer and immortality. The author does not project his own convictions and insights into the subject matter, but attempts to summarize the positions of leading thinkers in these fields. This section is of value to the religious thinker who wishes to freshen his historical perspective; and it will be of value to the religious worker whose temperament or training has left him unfamiliar with major historical interpretations of basic religious truths. The reader will not find an integrated statement of the author's philosophical and religious beliefs. But he will be stimulated and enriched in reading a concise and compact summarization of the basic religious positions of a great variety of interpreters covering a wide range of time, and related to many different situations.

LLOYD ELLIS FOSTER.

Calvary Church,
East Orange, New Jersey.

Readings in St. John's Gospel. (First Series: Chapters I-XII.) By WILLIAM TEMPLE. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$2.75.

LONG renowned as scholar, theologian and preacher, this book represents the Archbishop of York's initial attempt in the field of Biblical exposition. To say that it has obvious affinities with Charles Gore's expositions of the Epistles is only to suggest that it takes its place in the splendid tradition of Anglican scholarship. Disclaiming any intention of writing a commentary for scholars and theologians as such, Doctor Temple offers his creation to "souls on pilgrimage," and states his purpose by saying: "I am chiefly concerned with what arises in my mind as I read. . . . I am concerned with what the Holy Spirit says to me through the Gospel." No great amount of attention is given to the question of authorship, though for reasons sufficiently convincing to himself (and, I should say, to many others), the author believes that the Fourth Gospel was written by one immediately associated with the Beloved Disciple. The apostolic authority of the Gospel is, he thinks, conclusively proved and its historical elements essentially accurate. The author of the Gospel was not (as several recently published Johanne studies or the findings of the Archbishop's Commission would have it) the work of an unknown Christian mystic who wrote about the year 110 A. D. The Gospel was written earlier than that; and its author was not a mystic but a sacramentalist!

Based upon Westcott and Hort's text, the translation is the author's own. By the frequent retention of the order of the Greek words, and by the choice of words which sometimes exaggerate the shade of meaning conveyed by the original, the Greekless student is given genuine assistance in grasping the exact nuance of

the language. Moreover, the practical and penetrating quality of the exposition is constant. There is scarcely a page which does not hold some new or arresting insight. The meticulously accurate attention given to the smallest points is revealing of the illumination which is in store for all serious and unhurried students of Holy Scripture. The fact that Doctor Temple recognizes the Fourth Gospel to be "the profoundest of all writings," means that he has brought to its study not only a searching historical and philosophical criticism of the text, but also, a mind singularly capable of penetrating beyond criticism to the deepest meaning of apostolic experience. In this he provides what most commentaries lack and, manifestly, what most students urgently need.

HOBART D. MCKEEHAN.

The Abbey Church,
Huntingdon, Pa.

Types of Religious Philosophy. By
EDWIN ARTHUR BURTT. New
York: Harper and Brothers. \$3.00.

THIS volume fills a long-felt need in the realm of Christian thought. Books on Christian philosophy there are in plenty, but Professor Burtt has written another such book with a real difference.

The author modestly disclaims any intention of solving the problems of philosophical thought in religion, but he expresses the feeling of many when he says, "Here is a volume which would have been very helpful to me had I met with it when I first began to struggle seriously with the problems of religious thought." His avowed purpose in writing this book is that of "Providing, in a form as undistorted as possible by partisan bias, the historical materials and comparative analyses on which as a foundation the contemporary student may make reflective progress toward his own solutions." This purpose

has been well realized throughout the book.

The clarity and fairness of Professor Burtt's presentation is, no doubt, due in part to the fact that the material was first used with his classes in Cornell University. Out of that mutual quest of teacher and students has come a vital element, which, together with a fine historical perspective and a rich philosophical perspicuity, has produced a really great study of balanced and lasting value.

Chapter Two, on "The Historical Background," lays the best foundation for an adequate understanding of Christian philosophy that the present reviewer has ever read. Briefly but succinctly, beginning with the early Hebrew religion, he has traced the development of religious philosophical thinking through the later Hebrew religion, the Exile, the life and teachings of Jesus, the theology of Paul, the Greek Philosophy, Plato, Aristotle, up to and including Stoicism and Neo-Platonism. These various elements are presented as a connected story of developing religious thought, finally integrated in the Christian orthodoxy of the early Christian centuries. Then he carries this story into Augustine's synthesis, which dominated Western Christendom through the Middle Ages down to the Protestant Reformation. It is doubtful if this story, so basic to an understanding of Western Civilization, has ever before, in such brief compass, been told so well. This chapter is basic to the remainder of the book, and should be mastered before going on to a study of the seven types of philosophy that are presented.

One of the best chapters is that on "The Catholic Philosophy of Religion." It is timely, on account of the recent vogue of Neo-Thomism, and also because of the return to Rome of many disillusioned Protestants. Confessing the importance of the Catholic philosophy in

modern times, and owning up to no personal experience with this important phase of thinking, he wisely turned for help in preparing this chapter to a group of Catholic friends. Beginning with Saint Thomas Aquinas, he traces the development of Catholic thought through the Middle Ages and down to modern times. He closes with a discussion of the Catholic attitude toward modern science, and modern social systems. It is interesting, well written, sympathetic, kindly critical, and of especial value to the non-Catholic reader.

At the end of each chapter the author presents a valuable outline of "The Disputed Assumptions" of the philosophy under consideration. This enables the reader to make comparisons, and thus better understand the various systems and their relation to one another. A well-selected bibliography and an excellent index add greatly to the worth of this splendid volume.

This book is well adapted for class use, either for college students or in voluntary courses with young people. Pastors and teachers of religion will find it valuable as a reference and source book. The one weakness of the book, if it be a weakness, is that the author, who is an avowed humanist, rather overstates his case for humanism. But this cannot well be a serious criticism, for are we not all somewhat guilty of this? Where lives the man who can prevent his own basic philosophy from shining through the chinks, as he speaks or writes?

SIDNEY A. GUTHRIE.

Galesburg, Illinois.

Theories of Religious Experience.

By JOHN MORLISON MOORE. New York: Round Table Press. \$3.00.

HERE is a book which calls for enthusiastic appreciation. Doctor Moore gives a clear, scholarly analysis of the philo-

sophical viewpoints of James, Otto, and Bergson as these viewpoints relate to the study of religious experience. His penetrating insights help us to understand why these empirical approaches to religious phenomena have definitely changed the climate in this field of study.

He traces accurately the thinking of James, who locates "religious experience within experience at large" and makes "religious experience the creative or first-hand aspect of religion." He notes the confusion in the thinking of James concerning all mental activity in that there is an awkward dualism between conscious and subconscious, experience knowledge and conceptual knowledge, truth and utility. Even more important is the fact that experience can hardly be something wholly apart from rational interpretation. Yet there is genuine appreciation of the careful exploration of James among the complex, inward facts of religious experience.

In following the thought of Rudolph Otto, Moore points out that, unlike James, he makes religious experience or feeling a distinct kind of experience. Likewise, he gives to "religious feeling" something authentic in religion, and separates it from mental processes. This raises the problem of providing for ethical drive and religious convictions for benevolent or social action.

Perhaps the best section of the book is the interpretation of Bergson's position and the evaluation of his findings. The positivistic philosophy of Bergson brings pressure upon the individual through the "vital impetus" or "society," to produce moral obligation and dynamic religion. But there is an oversimplification of mystical elements as adequate explanations for complex personal religion.

In the final chapter on "Fundamental Problems," caution is advised against mistaking some phases of individual or group

religious experience for the whole and then setting it up as a standard. He clears up some confusions which inhere in a vague use of "mysticism." In any case mysticism is an ingredient in religious experience and not a distinct, authentic type of such experience (p. 224).

It is a readable, informing book. Religious experience, whether in variety or as a distinct entity, is never to be trusted as a guide of life till it has been rationally and critically examined. With such examination the future of religious psychology is likely to deal in a large way.

LOUIS C. WRIGHT.

Baldwin-Wallace College,
Berea, Ohio.

God in History. By OTTO PIPER.
New York: The Macmillan Company. \$2.00.

THE author was successor to Karl Barth in Theology at University of Münster, Germany. His lectures on Church and State led to his dismissal. As an expatriate he has landed congenially in the chair of Systematic Theology at Princeton Theological Seminary. He aims to give "a survey of history from the Christian point of view and in the clear light of Biblical revelation." A philosophy or theology of history is promised later.

Doctor Piper is extremely Biblical, and "Christ-intoxicated." In history God as its Lord has been varyingly active; and our author is telling us when, and how, and what it means. The whole process was meant to effectualize in all the world the majesty and glory of God. There are distinguishable parts to history: pre-history, suprahistorical, secular or general, and "holy" history (sacred, "divine interference"). Only the Bible offers an adequate view of history. The divine, eternal Logos came into history in the

theandric nature of Christ. The Incarnation was the crux and key to all history. Christ was, and had to be, virgin-born. "Only through the hypostatic union in the Virgin's womb did He become able to carry out His priestly work." Christ's life was the extensive and detailed fulfillment of Old Testament prophecies. Satan and satanic powers had perverted at will God's good world until Christ came. Since then they are curbed and will be wholly throttled at the end of this age, which is the final aeon.

God has given general revelation to mankind, and special revelations at many critical turns. Man's insufficiency has been manifested over and over. Natural knowledge and secular philosophy have meaning only within the Christian framework. Holy history is God's way at work centrally in all history. Through the Church the Living Christ has continued to confound secular men and to discipline the saving minority. Civilization can not be saved except through heroic loyalty to Christ and the Biblical truth in this last hour. The Second Coming can not be dated, but God's purpose requires it, and we must be actively ready. Man continually errs and fails, but the transcendent God will not be defeated; some will be saved.

The author's "survey" is drawn on a grand scale. It is a bold, confident, consistent presentation of Biblical Christianity as the key to all history. To some it will seem to be gnosis with a vengeance. It is an impressive reaffirmation of first-century faith, and a challenging hypothesis to those who can not agree with it. It is one of several books which have appeared in recent months, not especially agreeable to the contemporary American mind, but which cannot be disregarded.

HORACE T. HOUF.

Ohio University.

Psychology Serving Religion. By RICHARD D. HOLLINGTON. New York: The Abingdon Press. \$2.00.

Health for Mind and Spirit. By W. L. NORTHIDGE. New York: The Abingdon Press. \$2.00.

DOCTOR HOLLINGTON is Professor of Church Administration and Pastoral Counseling in Garrett Biblical Institute. His book will be of genuine value to ministers and Christian leaders in that it gives to them a concise account of the techniques and principles of genetic psychology, especially as these various techniques and principles are related to spiritual realities.

One of the very real perils that faces the young minister today is that the wealth of knowledge available to him in the realm of psychology may tempt him to become a consulting psychologist with a little flavor of religion added. He may also be led to venture into fields where he is not competent to serve. Doctor Hollington must have had these dangers in mind for he utters a very definite word of caution on page 202: "Is this a case for a physician—are there evidences of physical disease? Is this a case for a psychiatrist—are there evidences of mental diseases, such as delusions, hallucinations, symptoms of dementia praecox? In case of any doubt, do not attempt any spiritual treatment until you have the report and advice and consent of the psychiatrist."

In *Psychology Serving Religion* there is a maximum of psychology and a minimum of religion. The book would have been more useful to ministers if the author had described in detail what are "the methods and resources of religious psychotherapy" instead of merely referring to them. Nevertheless, it would be difficult to find a better digest of the principles of psychology than that which is given in Doctor Hollington's book. Each chapter

gives evidence of wide reading and a scholarly understanding of his subject.

This work is divided into four parts: Book I. "The Genesis of the Soul"; Book II. "Normal Adjustment"; Book III. "Maladjustment"; Book IV. "Readjustment." At the end of each chapter is a useful list of references and an excellent and extensive bibliography. This feature alone makes *Psychology Serving Religion* of great value to the reader who wishes to continue more extensive studies in this field. Every progressive minister would be well advised to read this book.

Doctor Northridge is a tutor at Edgehill College, Belfast, Ireland, and has specialized in philosophy and the practice of psychology. His book is directed to ministers, doctors, welfare workers, and all who exercise a ministry of health, and offers to them a constructive technique.

In view of the fact that the book will be read largely by ministers, the author is to be commended for emphasizing in his introduction that his first inquiry of each person soliciting an interview is whether the patient has been to a doctor. If his reply is in the negative, Doctor Northridge seeks medical assurance that there is nothing organically wrong. He adds that in "mental" cases he gives only such advice as he thinks will help. One is rather surprised therefore to find in Chapter II, on "The Major Psychoses," which is specifically directed to ministers, sentences which seem to infer that the minister should normally expect to diagnose mental illnesses. On page 21, after having set forth the symptoms of schizophrenia, he adds: "Many of the foregoing symptoms appear in cases that are not schizophrenics. There is danger, therefore, of jumping to conclusions too hurriedly. We should never pronounce dogmatically until, in addition to the symptoms mentioned, or at least a selection of

them, hallucinations, or delusions, or both, are manifest."

But ministers should be careful never to pronounce at all on mental cases either dogmatically or undogmatically, for to do so is to overstep the limits of their training, to imperil the welfare of the patients, and to bring upon themselves the merited wrath of the medical psychiatrists.

Doctor Northridge has written an interesting and readable book which offers to all those engaged in personal counseling a brief and accurate summary of the latest findings of psychology, especially as they bear upon mental health. The most helpful section of the book from the minister's standpoint is that included in Chapters VIII to XIV, which deal more specifically with the contribution of religion to health of mind and spirit. In these chapters Doctor Northridge's Christian witness is explicit and convincing.

JOHN SUTHERLAND BONNELL.

The Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church,
New York City.

A Testament of Faith. By P. G. S. HOPWOOD. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$2.00.

Essential Christianity. By S. ANGUS. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$2.00.

THESE two volumes present expositions of the heart of religion as seen by two writers previously known chiefly by books in the New Testament field. They are united also in their adherence to the older type of liberalism and a rejection of the newer reassertions of the historic Christian positions.

Hopwood's contribution to the *Great Issues of Life* series, which is edited by Rufus Jones, is dedicated to the description and defense of that "remarkable amalgam," religious experience. Against a background of the history of philosophy,

modern psychology, and science, he defends the validity of religious experience, which is held to be no more of a projection than is all experience. Against Dewey, he defends the reality of a genuine experiencing subject; against supernaturalists, he contends that religious experience is interwoven with all our experience. It is original, underived, and has its own structural capacity. Its essential character is "faith," defined as "the dynamic attitude with which we confront life," "the forward-pressing activity of the whole personality." This faith is self-attesting on the side of feeling, of mind, and of action. Yet the ultimate validity of religious experience rests in God "active in the soul by which a new stage of achievement is reached."

Coming from a man who has written a three-hundred-and-fifty-page book on primitive Christian experience, this is a most amazing volume. It is true, that the present volume is concluded by ten pages in which the author expresses the belief that God has revealed Himself in Christ. If that is really believed, however, why does not *A Testament of Faith* start with that conviction? If the pages of discussion of Kant and the new psychology are considered important to convince certain classes of readers, why do they not come after the peculiar nature of *Christian* experience has been set forth? But that is what is never done. Whether there might be a radical difference in religious experience is not considered. It is assumed that "the mystical sense of presence is the best illustration of religious experience." Wesley is cited in the exposition of mysticism despite the fact that he was a lifelong foe of mysticism, and his own Aldersgate experience was not mysticism at all. Hopwood assumes the natural capacity of man to rise to God. That may be true, but it was certainly not the assumption of those who proclaimed

the first Christian gospel, nor has it been the historic belief of the Christian Church.

The background of Angus's plea for *Essential Christianity* is the belief that some very unessential things have become primary in our churches. His polemic against the stress on creeds and institutionalism, upon a sterile dogmatism and desired uniformity, should serve a useful purpose in many quarters. But there are other circles which need much more a stress upon the difference between Christianity and current idealisms. What is the *essence* of this changing spiritual movement which we call Christianity?

Angus is insistent that this is not to be reached by any minimizing process. Essential Christianity is that which is essential for the purposes of Christ in human life and society. The only test is Christ-like character; dogma should never be made essential. What is central in our religion lies "in our highest spiritual affirmations in loyalty to Jesus and obedience to the will of God."

The valid criticisms and real elements of truth reiterated over and over again in this readable book should not blind us, however, to the assumptions on which its author proceeds. Here is an eloquent plea for a "liberal" reinterpretation of Christianity into a religion from which all dualism has disappeared, and hence all need for redemption in the Biblical sense. The essential unity of God and man is proclaimed. Porter's thesis is enthusiastically adopted that even Paul does not ascribe to Jesus any uniqueness which excludes imitation. (However, the reader is not told of the critical operations on the Pauline letters necessary to make such a conclusion possible.) The "religion of Jesus" position is vigorously championed; "Nothing can be essential to Christianity which was not essential to Jesus." That sounds very impressive until one remembers that Jesus was a Jew. The logic of

that position is that the history of the Christian Church based on the belief in the resurrection of Christ was a huge mistake, and we all ought to become liberal Jews.

But the logic of the position is not carried through. Time and again Angus returns to traditional Christian vocabulary, and something very close to the historic assertions of the Church. May the modern ecumenical movement take more to heart his insistence on the necessity for change in continuity if Christianity is to live! There is a present continuing revelation. But this statement of essential Christianity needs most careful examination to make sure that all is continued which is really essential to Christianity. Here is a book containing liberalism's answer. Is it the true one?

CLARENCE T. CRAIG,

Oberlin College.

The Knowledge of God and the Service of God. By KARL BARTH. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$5.00.

No intention of detracting from the value of this book is indicated when one says that the first impression it gives rise to is one of profound astonishment that it could ever have been produced on the Gifford Foundation. If anything is explicit in the will of Lord Gifford creating the Foundation, it was that the lectures to be delivered in its name were to be limited to "Natural Theology." These lectures are a flat violation of this instruction, since they deal with the knowledge of God and the service of God *according to the Reformation*, and with especial reference to "The Scottish Confession of 1560."

Barth was fully aware of the situation. When he received the invitation to give the Gifford Lectures at the University of Aberdeen in 1937 and 1938, he reminded

the Senatus that he was a theologian of the Reformed Church and did not believe in even the possibility of "Natural Theology." Since the invitation was still held out, he says that he felt justified in accepting it. He then proceeds to justify his consideration of *revealed* theology by a piece of reasoning which comes perilously near to being casuistry. He says that so-called "Natural Theology," in order to maintain its vigor, needs occasionally to be confronted with a theology of an exactly opposite kind. Barth will therefore give future Gifford lecturers an opportunity to do their work more effectively by reason of their having before them this example of what they are to avoid! Indeed, when people hear once more what "Revealed Theology" is, they may turn to "Natural Theology" with strengthened convictions! So a man who describes himself as "an avowed opponent of all natural theology" deliberately incurs the risk of strengthening a cause in which he does not believe!

One may readily enough admit the desirability of some way being found to broaden the scope of the Gifford Lectures, but one questions whether so palpable an evasion of the intent of the Foundation was the right way to begin the change.

This criticism has nothing to do with the intrinsic worth of the book itself. Those who hesitate to undertake Barth's more formidable works will find here much of his distinctive teaching, but expressed with a quite unusual clarity and simplicity. This is doubtless due in part to the translators. Each of the twenty lectures is based on one or more of the articles of the *Confessio Scotica* of 1560 (see Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, vol. III, pp. 437ff., for both the English (old style) and Latin texts. Barth follows the old-style spelling, and it will test the reader's ingenuity). The lectures are, in effect, a straight and uncom-

promising exposition of the Reformed doctrine concerning the Word of God. This is not to be taken as meaning that Barth deals simply with such questions as the inspiration and authority of Scripture. The *Confession* he expounds is a comprehensive statement of faith. The Word of God means what God has revealed about Himself in Jesus Christ. In view of our knowledge of God, what is to be our service of God? This is the question, and Barth deals with it vigorously and without compromise. His sheer theological genius must be recognized even by those who disagree with him. He never permits us to lose sight of the fact that we have to do with a *revelation*, and that a revelation can be approached and accepted only in *faith*. It is this steady insistence on the place and function of faith that is one of Barth's chief contributions to our time. How the standpoint bears on even so difficult a question as that of Predestination may be seen in Lecture VII.

EDWIN LEWIS.

Drew Theological Seminary.

The Art of Conducting Public Worship. By ALBERT W. PALMER. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$2.50.

Living the Christian Faith. By EDWIN EWART AUBREY. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$1.50.

THE chief business of the Church is to set forth and foster the religious life. The supreme function of the Church is worship—to give God His worth! This book by Doctor Palmer is in the natural succession of Willard L. Sperry's *Reality in Worship*, Von Ogden Vogt's *Modern Worship* and Evelyn Underhill's philosophical study of the inner values of worship.

The book grows out of Doctor Palm-

er's conviction that "the conduct of public worship probably is the weakest point in the ordinary Protestant church." It is written to help the nonliturgical church to a better appreciation of its real task. It is a book for the pastor, the thoughtful layman and the choirmaster. It is not academic, but combines an understanding philosophy of worship with a practical wisdom born out of a rich pastoral experience.

The recent great conferences at Oxford and Edinburgh in 1937 and Madras in 1939 found in the practice of worship real unities and abiding experiences. God became very real. He became real because worship is participation in the life of God. Worship is not an escape mechanism.

At the very center of the life of the Church must be the absolute certainty of the living God. Only from this conviction can modern worship speak to the timeless element in human nature and lift man above the tyranny of time and sense. Man must live his life within two environments—time and eternity—and only an experience of the eternal can give him mastery over the temporal. As Carlyle put it: "We cannot stand firm in time until we have gained a foothold somewhere beyond time." Worship helps man, a creature of time, to become a creative participant in God's purpose for life beyond time.

Thoughtful men of our day want an assurance of God. We are mistaken if we suppose that men chiefly desire to be pleasantly entertained or extraordinarily delighted when they go into a church. They may not be able to express it, but they persist in going there because they desire to enter a Holy Presence; they want to approach One before whom they can be still and know that He is God. We need a revival of worship at the heart of our Protestant Churchmanship.

We must cultivate the art of worship. Great music, noble liturgy and worthy symbolism must be used to make men aware of the presence and reality of God. Our churches must be used to inspire awe and reverence, faith and trust. From services of worship where men have actually been brought into the presence of God they will go out into the world cleansed, uplifted and inspired.

Worship is man's chief end—to enjoy God. Men are athirst for the living God. When man brings his offering of thought and resolve to the living God then God is able to achieve His will for man and His Kingdom does come.

Does this mean that the pulpit must take a secondary place in the life of the Protestant Church? By no means! Preaching must be sacramental in quality. Here are the closing words of Doctor Palmer: "These are days which demand great preaching, God knows! But, that it may be truly preaching and not just philosophizing or oratory, it needs all the more to be an integral part of a great experience of worship. No worship without preaching! That is to say, preaching must always enrich the content and give direction and purpose to worship. But also, no preaching without worship! Which is to say that out of worship comes the noblest preaching endowed with spiritual insight and powers of self-criticism. It takes both worship and preaching to work the miracle of divine communion and consecration which men need so urgently today."

Doctor Palmer's book has a noteworthy contribution to make to anyone who recognizes the essential elements in the conduct of public worship.

The little handbook, *Living the Christian Faith*, is a direction pointer. It points the practical significance of theology for everyday living. The central concern for religion is of God and His relation

to men. Has God made us, given us lofty aspirations and glorious dreams, only to leave us to the mercy of the superstitions and fears and prejudices which lead us, scarcely knowing what we do, into the prison house of our own acquisitive system and its inevitable wars? Shall we be saved by faith in God or by a stern endeavor to take the universe and ourselves as we find them and then to see at what point we can remold our lives nearer to the highest aspirations of our race?

Theology grows out of man's response to life's deepest questions. As Doctor Aubrey says: "Is there any meaning to it all?" men ask in hours of exhaustion and disillusionment; and the Christian leader answers with a faith in God, rationale of our universe, source of our ideals, strength of our sensitive weakness, consummator of the meanings of all our acts."

Here is a tract for the times that is sure that an answer to our deep questions is in terms of a great and convincing affirmation of God. But there are thousands of our contemporaries who do not hear our confession of faith. The kind of world that we live in does not give satisfactory evidence of the power of our faith in God. Those who claim to know the supremacy of a God of love in actual experience look not to love but to unbridled power for their protection in the emergencies of war and social collapse. In their daily lives too they are caught in the shoddy meshes of compromise.

Is it enough to witness the inner comfort of religion? The pressures of living create their own problems. Doctor Aubrey is not unaware of this fact: "The tension of Christian living is relieved by recalling that the beauties of this world

are God's also. This the prophet too often forgets; he will not let us enter the art gallery as long as the slums are there. The priest and prophet need each other, and it is well that we have both: the priest to make God known to us in the midst of life, the prophet to urge us on to the hidden God of the life that is yet to be. It is God who has made us for Himself so that we are restless; and on this God we can rely even as we struggle. Then we are at peace."

If we are out on the quest of truth, we cannot turn aside to enter any paradise of illusion. Wondering how this book would impress present day college students, I asked two undergraduates to read it. Both lads reported the book helpful. An Oberlin College Junior said this: "The author's reference to 'a frame of reference' was for me particularly well taken. I don't know yet what to base my life philosophy on. I am afraid that I am struggling to come out of that hapless drifting in which many students find themselves today. I want to buck that current with an eternal eye for the manifestations of that which tradition has taught me is the faith to follow. One thing I am convinced sincerely of, there can be no way of life which avoids conflicts and war save that based on the principles of Jesus Christ. My next step is to find as many of those principles as possible so that I am either more certain, or that the test shows a better way." Here is a little book that is not unaware of the history that lies at the heart of classic Christianity, and that points the way for an American contribution to theology.

OSCAR THOMAS OLSON.

Minister in Epworth-Euclid Church,
Cleveland, Ohio.

Bookish Brevities

The sustained production of religious books in a period of prolonged depression elicits this comment from a business review: "Signs notwithstanding, the demand for religious books is perennial and increases rather than abates in an age of sophistication."

Reluctantly conceding that the radio increasingly exercises the most influential pressure upon public opinion, literature tenaciously maintains that the writer still best expresses what the world is thinking.

Christopher Morley affixes his stamp of approval to the statement that no transaction in the arts is complete until at least one other person has received what the creator has imagined and tried to communicate.

America lost an accredited man of letters in the passing of Benjamin Brawley of Howard University. He found his inspiration in President John Hope of Morehouse College and channeled character and culture for hundreds of young Negro scholars. He was the author of *History of the English Hymn*, and several other volumes.

One of the glaring deficiencies of the discussion fad in education was the disparagement of books. Now President William A. Neilson of Smith College is saying, "Books are the medium through which the greater part of adult education has to be carried on. Literature that matters cannot be read without engaging in the painful occupation of think-

ing and most of us are reluctant to engage in it. What we educators are doing in the long run, is to lead people up to books in the hope that with the aid of them they will proceed to educate themselves."

The Brooklyn Public Library is one of the new noble buildings of the country. The inscriptions at the entrance are commanding attention.

"This public library, through the joining of municipal enterprise and private generosity, offers to all the people perpetual and free access to the knowledge and the thought of all the ages."

"Here are enshrined the longing of great hearts

And noble things that tower above the tide

The magic word that winged wonder starts

The garnered wisdom that has never died."

"I pay homage to the incomparable splendor of the Acropolis," writes Russell Henry Stafford in *Advance*, after his recent travels. "What these days spent under such skies as only Greece can show, meant to a passionate amateur of the classic Greek tongue and culture, it would be impossible for me to put into words. At least I may say that here is one celebrated scene, and the only one known to me, which could not conceivably disappoint any anticipation: it surpasses every dream. At last I have seen beauty, beauty itself, not in replica or reflection, but in substance, of which I think the most beautiful

places and things elsewhere are only faded shadows."

The booklover has a distinguishing feeling for his books. To read them and to possess them affords him double joy. He would miss volumes which he opens but occasionally if they were not available for his varying moods.

"No man is or ever will be a genuine booklover," declares the veteran bookman, George Jackson, "who is not also according to his ability and sometimes even a little beyond it, a book-buyer." Doctor Jackson avers that the average English-speaking person, the Scot excepted, is not a book-buying animal. He will spend without grudging on a good dinner, but he thinks a long time before he spends half as much on a good book—and then he does not spend it.

If, as is often said, books are the food of the mind, one can only wonder how multitudes of our fellows manage to keep their souls alive. Public libraries are eminently serviceable institutions, but, though the books of another may be our servants, it is only our own books that will ever be our friends. In comparison with them the books that belong to others seem cold and dissimilar.

Henry van Dyke used to talk about the complacent illusion of omniscience begotten in an ignorant person by the haphazard reading of a few volumes of philosophy or science. We read primarily to learn how to live. The books that are read by successive generations deal with the elemental questions, who and why I am, who are others and what have they to do with me and I with them? The moral sense is too deep within us to permit reading for amusement to satisfy. We demand that our literature have a timeless rightness, even though it has not the happy ending

congenial to the sanguine American spirit in contrast with the frustrations of Russian history and temperament.

In his Bowker Lecture at the New York Public Library, Alfred Harcourt described how the center of American publishing moved from Boston to New York, and not without some credit to the former city.

Between 1890 and 1914 immigration was often at the rate of one million a year, and New York came to have immense Jewish, Italian, and Danubian-European populations. While Boston continued to publish in accord with old American traditions, several new publishers came out of the immigrant life of New York, who began to turn out translations of contemporary foreign authors and books either by recently arrived Americans or Americans of international travel and association. Boston opposed these new cosmopolitan books as degrading to American taste and standards, but they were accepted the country wide. One of the results is a repeal of reticence which is often baffling to a publisher and occasionally irritating to a reader.

WHAT THE BOOKS DO

They stand here like a regiment at ease,
Gold-lettered on the black and red and blue,
Waiting for me to read them back to life
Or shift their ranks to make their honor new.

Their pied and peaceful colors wall the room,
Their titles tell me every passionate ghost,
And every blowing landscape shut inside
With words to hold them there, and poetry most.

Here, though my spirit darken or grow
 strange
 With restlessness and in the dark seem
 blind,
 The books will wait: they lift more light
 to me
 Than I shall ever leave this room to
 find.

—*The New York Times.*

.
 In his stimulating volume, *Recent Literature and Religion*, John R. Slater mixes his colors.

"We have seen the foundation of all faith and morals shaken. We have had reckless spending of government funds on social experiments disguised as relief. There is a drift toward collectivism at home as well as abroad. Representative government is everywhere in peril. There is widespread opportunism and improvisation in politics, domestic and foreign. That program of live-and-let-live among parties and among peoples which clear-sighted observers have urged for many

years seems farther away than ever. Intelligence does not control the world. For twenty-five years we have known what the inside of a volcano is like and yet are lingering on the rim. That our attitudes have been colored by disaster and disillusion is reflected in our literature.

In the sphere of social reforms the picture is brighter. Except for a growing tendency to leave the tasks of humanitarian welfare more and more to partisan control of public funds, and the conspicuous failure of city and county governments to maintain honesty and efficiency, there has been great social progress since 1900. Economic problems concerned with land, labor, capital, production, transportation, distribution, though far from solved, have been enormously advanced in our time. Those who deplore the recent rapid growth and aggressiveness of organized labor and the cost of social security should study the wages, hours, and conditions of labor in 1900 and ask themselves whether they really would like to see them restored.

V
 Jo
 W
 Lu
 Ha
 Ed
 Ch
 Al
 Wi
 Na
 Re
 Th
 Th
 De
 Ma
 Th
 Sta
 Th
 Wil
 The
 Nun
 The
 Joh
 Ma
 Boo
 Boo
 Ind
 Edit
 Busin
 Aven
 Enter
 1879.
 Subse
 foreign
 For t
 Road,

CIN